GROMOV-HAUSDORFF LIMIT OF WASSERSTEIN SPACES ON POINT CLOUDS

NICOLÁS GARCÍA TRILLOS

arXiv:1702.03464v2 [math.MG] 13 Apr 2017

Abstract. We consider a point cloud $X_n := \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$ uniformly distributed on the flat torus $\mathbb{T}^d := \mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$, and construct a geometric graph on the cloud by connecting points that are within distance ε of each other. We let $\mathcal{P}(X_n)$ be the space of probability measures on X_n and endow it with a discrete Wasserstein distance W_n as introduced independently in [7] and [15] for general finite Markov chains. We show that as long as $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n$ decays towards zero slower than an explicit rate depending on the level of uniformity of X_n, then the space $(\mathcal{P}(X_n), W_n)$ converges in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense towards the space of probability measures on $\mathbb{T}^d$ endowed with the Wasserstein distance.

1. Introduction

Inference of geometric properties of a ground-truth distribution based on observed data has become an important task with applications to machine learning. Let us assume that the points $X_n = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$ are sampled from some distribution supported on some manifold $\mathcal{M}$ embedded in Euclidean space; the manifold itself is assumed to be unknown. One possible way to extract geometric information from the underlying distribution, and in particular from the unknown manifold $\mathcal{M}$, is to first construct a geometric graph on the cloud X_n by fixing a length scale $\varepsilon > 0$ and then giving high weights to pairs of points that are within Euclidean distance ε of each other. The resulting graph structure can then be used to design procedures for data clustering (unsupervised learning), data classification (supervised learning) and dimensionality reduction. For all of these graph-based procedures, it is important (as with any procedure in statistics) to study their consistency and to quantify how accurately they reveal features from the ground-truth distribution.

Many of the graph-based procedures for which there are consistency results available are really optimization problems whose objective functionals incorporate the graph structure in one way or the other. This is the case for procedures like spectral clustering and total variation clustering, where the notions of graph Laplacian and graph perimeter are fundamental in the definition of the algorithms. Operators and functionals in the cloud are defined in close resemblance to operators and functionals in the continuum and it is often the case that this resemblance is the starting point for establishing consistency results. Results along these lines for spectral clustering are abundant, see for example [16, 19, 17, 20] and the references within. Consistency results for total variation clustering are presented in [18, 11] where the notion of Γ-convergence in a probabilistic setting is used. Consistency results for modularity clustering in a geometric graph setting are presented in [8].

This paper is conceived as a foundational stone in the attempt to establish consistency results for algorithms whose outputs are not solutions of optimization problems, but rather, the result of an evolution in time process; a few examples are the mean shift algorithm and variants like the blurred mean shift algorithm (see [5]). We leave the development of particular examples relevant to machine learning for future papers and at the moment we focus on giving a simple concrete setting that will serve as a model for how is that we envision the use of our results in more general settings.

Given the geometric graph on the point cloud, construct the graph Laplacian Δ_n (see Subsection 1.3 for definitions) and consider the heat equation on the graph

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_t = -\Delta_n \rho_t, \quad t \in (0, \infty)$$

together with some initial condition; in the above ρ is at all times a function defined on the point cloud. A basic consistency question one can ask is the following: if the initial condition of the equation is stable as $n \to \infty$, what happens to the solution to the discrete heat equation as the sample size grows? In particular, do we recover the heat equation in the continuum?

Obviously there is misspecification in the above questions, but let us try to illustrate a way in which one can answer them. Since the seminal work by Jordan, Kinderlehrer and Otto [14] it has been known that, at the continuum level (ground-truth level), the heat flow can be seen as a *gradient flow* of an energy (the entropy) defined over the space of probability measures endowed with the Wasserstein distance. Analogue results have been independently obtained by Maas [15] and Zhou et al. [7] at the level of the point clouds; indeed, the discrete heat flow can be seen as a gradient flow of a discrete entropy defined over the space of discrete probability measures endowed with a distance that in this paper we refer to as *discrete Wasserstein distance* (see [15] for the original reference or Subsection 1.4 below ; in [7] the analysis covers Fokker-Planck equations on graphs). With these interpretations for both the discrete and continuum heat flows, the consistency issue translates to showing the convergence of the discrete gradient flows towards the continuum gradient flow. In [12] a rather general framework for studying the convergence of gradient flows defined over different metric spaces has been proposed (it focuses on heat flows, but the analysis can be extended to settings of interest). One of the key conditions to verify, which connects directly with our work, is the *Gromov-Hausdorff* convergence of the metric spaces: in this paper the metric spaces that we consider are the discrete Wasserstein spaces defined on point clouds and we study their Gromov-Hausdorff limit as $n \to \infty$.

We finish this introduction by mentioning a related work [13] where the authors study a similar problem to ours but in the setting where the points cloud are aligned on regular grids and the associated graphs are nearest neighbor graphs. The general structure of our paper follows closely the one in [13]. Also, as in [13] we assume that the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is simply the d-dimensional flat torus $\mathbb{T}^d$ and that the ground-truth distribution is the uniform distribution on $\mathbb{T}^d$; this is done to keep the differential geometry technicalities to a minimum, but we anticipate that generalizations to more general manifolds and distributions are possible and the details will be presented elsewhere.

1.1. **Outline.** The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 1.2 we revisit the definition of the Wasserstein space in $\mathbb{T}^d$ and recall the Benamu-Brenier formulation for the Wasserstein distance. In section 1.3 we consider geometric graphs on point clouds and introduce the notions of graph Laplacian, discrete gradient and divergence with respect to such graphs. We then proceed to define the discrete Wasserstein distance; this is done in section 1.4. In section 1.5 we present the Gromov-Hausdorff distance between metric spaces. With all the background and assumptions in place we state explicitly the main result of the paper; we do this in section 1.6. We then consider some preliminary results. In section 2.1 we present some a priori estimates for the discrete Wasserstein distance. In sections 2.2 and 2.3 we consider some results that we refer to as smoothening steps in continuous and discrete settings. In section 2.4 we collect the last auxiliary results that we need for the proof of our main result. Finally, in section 3 we prove our main results.

1.2. **Wasserstein distance in the continuum and Benamu-Brenier formula.** Let us now consider $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the set of Borel probability measures on $\mathbb{T}^d$. This set can be endowed with the Wasserstein distance induced by the Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{T}^d$. Indeed, for $\mu, \tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the Wasserstein distance $W(\mu, \tilde{\mu})$ is defined as

$$(W(\mu, \tilde{\mu}))^2 := \min_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mu, \tilde{\mu})} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{T}^d} |x - y|^2 d\pi(x, y),$$

where $\Gamma(\mu,\tilde{\mu})$ denotes the set of *couplings* (also known as transportation plans) from μ into $\tilde{\mu}$, that is, measures on the product space $\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{T}^d$ whose first and second marginals are μ and $\tilde{\mu}$ respectively. The quantity $|x-y|$ stands for the Euclidean metric (on $\mathbb{T}^d$) between x and y.

The work of Benamou and Brenier [2] shows that the distance $W(\mu,\tilde{\mu})$ is realized by a curve in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ of *minimal action* connecting μ and $\tilde{\mu}$. More precisely, for any $\mu,\tilde{\mu}\in\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$,

$$(W(\mu,\tilde{\mu}))^2 = \min \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\vec{V}_t(x)|^2 d\mu_t(x)dt,$$

where the min is taken over all solutions $(\mu_t,\vec{V}_t)$ to the continuity equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mu_t + \operatorname{div}(\vec{V}_t\mu_t) = 0, \tag{1.1}$$

with $\mu_0=\mu$ and $\mu_1=\tilde{\mu}$. In general, the continuity equation has to be interpreted in the distributional sense, that is, (1.1) is interpreted as

$$\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left(\frac{d}{dt}\phi(x,t) + \langle \vec{V}_t(x), \nabla_x \phi(x,t)\rangle\right) d\mu_t(x)dt, \quad \forall \phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d\times(0,1)),$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\phi(x)d\mu_t(x) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla\phi\cdot\vec{V}_t(x)d\mu_t(x), \quad \forall\phi\in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d).$$

See Chapter 8 in [1].

When the measures μ_t are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, that is $d\mu_t(x)=\rho_t(x)dx$, and in addition $\rho_t>0$, we may work with *flux vector fields* and the continuity equation (1.1) may be written in *flux form* as

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_t + \operatorname{div}(\vec{V}_t) = 0,$$

where $\vec{V}_t$ in the above formula is the flux: ρ_t times $\vec{V}_t$ in (1.1). As before we have to interpret the above expression in the distributional sense, but we remark that when the densities and flux vector fields are smooth the equation can also be interpreted in the classical sense. Finally, the total action associated to a solution to the continuity equation in flux form is defined as

$$\int_0^1 \mathcal{A}(\rho_t,\vec{V}_t)dt$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}(\rho_t,\vec{V}_t) := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{|\vec{V}_t(x)|^2}{\rho_t(x)}dx.$$

With this notation, it then follows that for an arbitrary solution to the continuity equation in flux form (connecting the densities ρ_0 and ρ_1) we have

$$(W(\mu_0,\mu_1))^2 \le \int_0^1 \mathcal{A}(\rho_t,\vec{V}_t)dt.$$

In the remainder we use $\vec{V}_t$ to denote both, vector fields and flux vector fields. There should be no confusion about this because we will always specify if a curve $t\mapsto(\mu_t,\vec{V}_t)$ is a solution to the continuity equation or the continuity equation in flux form.

1.3. **Gradients, divergence and Laplacian at the discrete level.** Let us first introduce the notions of gradient, divergence and Laplacian for arbitrary discrete setting where the starting point is a finite weighted graph (X,ω). We will later specify the general setting to what we will refer to as the *geometric setting*, where the set X is a point cloud in $\mathbb{T}^d$ that "approximates" the uniform measure on $\mathbb{T}^d$, and where the weights depend on the distance between points.

Let X be a set with N elements, $\omega: X\times X\to[0,\infty)$ a positive function, γ a probability measure on X and ε a positive number. In what follows we write $\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ instead of $\gamma(\{\mathbf{x}\})$ and assume that γ gives positive mass to every point in X.

Let $L^2(\gamma)$ be the set of functions of the form $u : X \to \mathbb{R}$. In other words, $L^2(\gamma)$ is the set of real valued functions on X. Naturally, $L^2(\gamma)$ can be endowed with an inner product defined by

$$\langle u, v\rangle_{L^2(\gamma)} := \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in X} u(\mathbf{x})v(\mathbf{x})\gamma(\mathbf{x}).$$

We denote by $\mathcal{P}(X)$ the set of all probability measures on X. From the fact that γ gives positive mass to every point in X it follows that there is a one to one correspondence between $\mathcal{P}(X)$ and the set of functions $\rho : X \to [0, \infty)$ for which

$$\int \rho(x)d\gamma(x) = \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in X} \rho(\mathbf{x}) = 1.$$

In the sequel we refer to such functions ρ as *discrete densities* and often times use the terms "density" and "measure" interchangeably.

Let us now introduce $\mathfrak{X}(X)$, the set of functions $V : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}$, i.e. the set of *discrete vector fields*. An inner product on $\mathfrak{X}(X)$ is defined by

$$\langle U, V\rangle_{\mathfrak{X}(X)} := \sum_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in X} U(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\gamma(\mathbf{x})\gamma(\mathbf{y}), \quad U, V \in \mathfrak{X}(X).$$

The divergence operator div_N takes discrete vector fields and returns functions on the point cloud. On the other hand, the gradient operator ∇_N takes functions on the cloud and returns discrete vector fields. More precisely, $\mathrm{div}_N : \mathfrak{X}(X) \to L^2(\gamma)$, $\nabla_N : L^2(\gamma) \to \mathfrak{X}(X)$ are given by

$$\mathrm{div}_N(V)(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{\mathbf{y}\in X} \left(V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - V(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})\right) \omega(x, y)\gamma(\mathbf{y}), \quad V \in \mathfrak{X}(X),$$

$$\nabla_N u(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \frac{u(\mathbf{y}) - u(\mathbf{x})}{\varepsilon}, \quad u \in L^2(\gamma).$$

A straightforward computation shows that div_N and $-\nabla_N$ are adjoint operators provided the weight matrix ω is symmetric. More explicitly we have the following.

Proposition 1.1. *Suppose that $\omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \omega(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})$ for every $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X$. Then, for any $u \in L^2(\gamma)$ and $U \in \mathfrak{X}(X)$ we have*

$$\langle \mathrm{div}_N(U), u\rangle_{L^2(\gamma)} = -\langle U, \nabla_N u\rangle_{\mathfrak{X}(X)}.$$

From now on we assume that ω is symmetric.

The *graph Laplacian* $\Delta_N : L^2(\gamma) \to L^2(\gamma)$ is defined by

$$\Delta_n := -\mathrm{div}_N \circ \nabla_N.$$

From these definitions, and 1.1 it follow that Δ_n is a positive-semidefinite operator.

Let us now specify the previous definitions to a geometric setting. We consider a point cloud $X_n := \{\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$ contained in $\mathbb{T}^d$ and denote by ν_n the empirical measure

$$\nu_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}.$$

The set X_n plays the role of the set X and the empirical measure ν_n the role of the measure γ in the previous abstract setting. We assume that the point cloud X_n, or better yet its empirical measure ν_n, approximates the measure ν (the uniform measure on $\mathbb{T}^d$) in a sense that we now make precise. Given two arbitrary probability measures $\mu, \tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, their ∞-OT distance, denoted $d_\infty(\mu, \tilde{\mu})$, is defined as

$$d_\infty(\mu, \tilde{\mu}) := \min_{\pi\in\Gamma(\mu,\tilde{\mu})} \sup_{(x,y)\in\mathrm{sup}(\pi)} |x - y|.$$

The ∞-OT distance measures the min-max cost of transporting one measure into the other. This is the distance that we use to measure how close ν_n is from ν. We point out that the ∞-OT distance between ν and ν_n admits a formulation in terms of transportation *maps*

$$d_\infty(\nu, \nu_n) = \min_{T_n \sharp \nu = \nu_n} \|Id - T_n\|_{L^\infty(\nu)},$$

where the min in the above formula is taken over all transportation maps between ν and ν_n. The existence and uniqueness of minimizers to this problem is established in [6], as well as the equivalence of $d_\infty(\nu, \nu_n)$ with the minimization problem involving transportation maps. From now on we use T_n to represent the optimal transportation map and we let

$$\delta_n := \|Id - T_n\|_{L^\infty(\nu)}. \tag{1.2}$$

Remark 1.2. Let Z be a finite subset of $\mathbb{T}^d$ with cardinality k and let μ_k be the empirical measure associated to Z, i.e. all points in Z are given the same weight. Then, regardless of what Z is , the ∞-OT distance between μ_k and ν satisfies the lower bound

$$\frac{C_d}{k^{1/d}} \leq d_\infty(\nu, \mu_k),$$

where C_d is a constant only depending on dimension. Indeed, if this was not the case, then it would be possible to construct k disjoint balls in $\mathbb{T}^d$ whose union has bigger ν-measure than $\mathbb{T}^d$ itself.

Let us now specify how the weights ω on $X_n \times X_n$ are defined, or in other words, how do we endow X_n with a weighted graph structure. First, consider the kernel function $\eta : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ defined by

$$\eta(r) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r \leq 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

and consider the quantity

$$\sigma_\eta := \int_0^\infty \eta(r) r^{d+1} dr = \frac{1}{d+2}. \tag{1.4}$$

For given $\varepsilon > 0$ we let $\eta_\varepsilon : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ be the rescaled version of η given by

$$\eta_\varepsilon(r) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon^d} \eta\left(\frac{r}{\varepsilon}\right),$$

and define the weight $w_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$ between $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j \in X_n$ by

$$w_{\varepsilon_n}(x, y) := \eta_{\varepsilon_n}(|x - y|), \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{T}^d,$$

for a given choice of parameter $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n$, where we have made the dependence of ε on n explicit for convenience.

Remark 1.3. Although for simplicity we focus on the kernel η defined above, we anticipate that all our results are still true for more general kernels. In particular, the proofs of the main results of this paper are still valid if we simply assume that η is a non-negative, compactly supported and non-increasing function.

In the remainder we use div_n, ∇_n, Δ_n to stand for the divergence, gradient and Laplacian in the geometric setting described above. We use u_n for arbitrary elements in $L^2(\nu_n)$ and V_n for arbitrary elements in $\mathfrak{X}(X_n)$. We can explicitly write

$$\nabla_n u_n(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \frac{u_n(\mathbf{x}_j) - u_n(\mathbf{x}_i)}{\varepsilon_n}, \quad u_n \in L^2(\nu_n),$$

$$\operatorname{div}_n V_n(\mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{1}{n\varepsilon_n^{d+1}} \sum_{j=1}^n (V_n(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) - V_n(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_i)) \eta\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|}{\varepsilon_n}\right), \quad V_n \in \mathfrak{X}(X_n).$$

1.4. **Discrete Wasserstein distance.** As in the previous section, we let (X, ω) be a weighted graph, γ a probability measure on X giving positive mass to every point in X and ε a positive number. Taking as a point of reference the Benamou-Brenier formulation of optimal transport in the continuum setting, we can define a discrete Wasserstein distance on the set $\mathcal{P}(X)$ by introducing the appropriate notions of discrete continuity equations and their actions. This has been done in [15] in the context of finite Markov chains.

Definition 1.4. *We say that $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\rho_t, V_t)$ satisfies the discrete continuity equation (in flux form) if*

(1) $\rho_t \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and $V_t \in \mathfrak{X}(X)$ for every $t \in [0,1]$.
(2) For every $\mathbf{x} \in X$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_t(\mathbf{x}) + \operatorname{div}_N(V_t)(\mathbf{x}) = 0. \tag{1.5}$$

Remark 1.5. Notice that the second condition in the above definition implies the first one provided that $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and ρ_t stays non-negative for every $t \in [0,1]$. Indeed, this follows from the fact that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in X}\rho_t(\mathbf{x})\gamma(\mathbf{x}) = -\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in X}\operatorname{div}_N(V_t)(\mathbf{x})\gamma(\mathbf{x}) = -\langle \operatorname{div}_N(V_t), \mathbb{1}\rangle_{L^2(\gamma)} = \langle V_t, \nabla_N \mathbb{1}\rangle_{\mathfrak{X}(X)} = 0,$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ represents the function that is identically equal to one.

In order to define the action associated to a solution to the discrete continuity equation $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\rho_t, V_t)$, we first need to specify a way in which we can interpolate the values of a density at different points in X so as to induce a "density" on the edges of the graph. We use an *interpolating function* $\theta : [0,\infty) \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ to do this. We make the following assumptions:

(1) Symmetry: $\theta(s,t) = \theta(t,s)$ for all s, t.
(2) Monotonicity: $\theta(r,t) \leq \theta(s,t)$ for all $r \leq s$ and all t.
(3) Positive homogeneity: $\theta(\lambda s, \lambda t) = \lambda\theta(s,t)$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$ and all s, t.
(4) Normalization: $\theta(1,1) = 1$. Combined with the positive homogeneity this implies that $\theta(\lambda,\lambda) = \lambda$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$.
(5) Concavity: The function $(x,y) \mapsto \theta(x,y)$ is concave.
(6) We assume that

$$C_\theta := \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta(1-t,t)}}dt < \infty.$$

Remark 1.6. Conditions (1)-(5) are all natural properties for an interpolating function. Regarding condition (6), we notice that this is the same assumption as in [15]. In a sense this is an optimal requirement as it is a necessary and sufficient condition for the discrete Wasserstein distance on a two point space to be finite (see Chapter 3 in [15]).

Remark 1.7. Typical examples of functions θ satisfying the above conditions are:

(1) The arithmetic mean

$$\theta_1(r,s) = \frac{r+s}{2}.$$

(2) The logarithmic mean defined by

$$\theta_2(r,s) = \int_0^1 r^u s^{1-u} du = \frac{r-s}{\log(r) - \log(s)}.$$

Remark 1.8. In all our main results the only assumptions we make on θ are (1)-(6). Nevertheless, we give special attention to the logarithmic mean given its close connection with the heat flow on the graph (see [15]).

Definition 1.9. *The total action (with respect to the interpolating function θ) associated to a solution $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\rho_t, V_t)$ to the discrete continuity equation is defined as*

$$\int_0^1 \mathcal{A}_N(\rho_t, V_t)dt, \tag{1.6}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_N(\rho_t, V_t) := \sum_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in X} \frac{(V_t(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}))^2}{\theta(\rho_t(\mathbf{x}), \rho_t(\mathbf{y}))} w(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\gamma(\mathbf{x})\gamma(\mathbf{y}).$$

In the definition of $\mathcal{A}_N(\rho_t, V_t)$ we use the convention that when V_t and θ are both equal to zero, then the quotient V_t^2/θ is also treated as zero. Also, if V_t is different from zero and θ is zero then the whole expression is given the value ∞.

Definition 1.10. *(Discrete Wasserstein distance) Let $\rho, \tilde{\rho} \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ be two discrete densities. The discrete Wasserstein distance $W_N(\rho, \tilde{\rho})$ is defined by*

$$(W_N(\rho, \tilde{\rho}))^2 := \inf \int_0^1 \mathcal{A}_N(\rho_t, V_t)dt,$$

where the inf *is taken over all solutions $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\rho_t, V_t)$ of the discrete continuity equation that satisfy*

$$\rho_0 = \rho, \quad \rho_1 = \tilde{\rho}.$$

Remark 1.11. We remark that the inf in the definition of the discrete Wasserstein distance can be replaced by min (see [9]). In other words, we can always find a geodesic connecting two arbitrary discrete probability measures.

We now consider two examples that illustrate the notions introduced before. The first example is related to the work in [13] and can be interpreted as a discrete model for local geometry. The second example is used in Section 2 and can be interpreted as a discrete model for non-local geometry.

Example 1.12 (Linear graph). Consider the set $X = \{0, 1/N, 2/N, \ldots, (N-1)/N\}$, and let γ be the uniform distribution on X. Let $\omega : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}$ be the transition matrix with zeros in all entries except at consecutive points where instead

$$\omega\left(\frac{i}{N}, \frac{i+1}{N}\right) = \omega\left(\frac{i}{N}, \frac{i-1}{N}\right) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \forall i = 0, \ldots, N-1.$$

In the above we are identifying the numbers 0 and 1 so that in particular the set X can be thought as a regular grid on the torus $\mathbb{T}^1$. We set $\varepsilon = 1$.

In this particular case it is intuitively simple to see that the geodesics in the resulting discrete Wasserstein space resemble those in the Wasserstein space over $\mathbb{T}^1$ (for example consider two discrete measures each concentrated at a point in X). This resemblance can be made rigorous and in fact the results from [13] show that the discrete Wasserstein space on this linear graph is (after appropriate rescaling) an approximation in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense of the usual Wasserstein space over $\mathbb{T}^1$. The situation in this example contrasts with that from Example 1.13 below where the geometry of $\mathbb{T}^1$ does not show up.

Example 1.13 (Complete graph). Let X be any finite set with N elements, γ be the uniform distribution on X, ω be the $N \times N$ transition matrix with $1/N$ in all its entries and $\varepsilon = 1$. After fixing an interpolating function θ satisfying the conditions (1)-(6), consider the discrete Wasserstein space associated to the setting just introduced and denote this space by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N)$ for future reference. The diameter $\mathrm{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N))$ of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N)$ is an important quantity that we will use in Section 2 and for that reason we concentrate on estimating it for some choices of θ of interest. In what follows we use the notation $\mathrm{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{K}_N)$ to emphasize the role of θ in the estimates.

Let us imagine we are in a situation where θ has the form

$$\theta(r,s) = \frac{r-s}{f'(r)-f'(s)}, \tag{1.7}$$

for some function f with $f'' > 0$ in $(0,\infty)$ so that in particular f is convex. Once the function θ is specified there are two extra degrees of freedom for choosing f and hence we can assume that $f(0) = f(1) = 0$. In this case, one simple way to obtain estimates on $\mathrm{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_n))$ is to use Talagrand's inequality in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N)$, where the idea is to find bounds for the distance in terms of an entropy functional $\mathcal{H}_{N,f}$ that can be written in terms of f; the condition $f(1) = 0$ guarantees that this entropy functional is non-negative. This approach relies on finding a lower bound for the Ricci curvature in the space $\mathcal{K}_N$; in turn, lower bounds on the Ricci curvature are defined in terms of convexity properties of the entropy functional $\mathcal{H}_{N,f}$. The previous discussion can be found in detail in [9]. Furthermore, explicit calculations in Section 5 in [9] show that

$$\mathrm{Ric}(\mathcal{K}_N) \geq \frac{1}{2} > 0,$$

a condition that when inserted in Talagrand's inequality (see Theorem 1.5 in [9]) implies that

$$W_N(\rho,\tilde{\rho}) \leq W_N(\rho,\mathbb{1}) + W_N(\mathbb{1},\tilde{\rho}) \leq C\max\{\sqrt{\mathcal{H}_{N,f}(\rho)}, \sqrt{\mathcal{H}_{N,f}(\tilde{\rho})}\}, \forall \rho,\tilde{\rho} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{N,f}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_{N,f}(\rho) := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in X} f(\rho(\mathbf{x})), \quad \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N).$$

Now, the convexity of the function f implies that the maximum of $\mathcal{H}_{N,f}$ is achieved at extremal points. This fact combined with the fact that $f(0) = 0$ implies that

$$\mathcal{H}_{N,f}(\rho) \leq \frac{f(N)}{N}, \quad \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N),$$

from where it follows that

$$\mathrm{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N)) \leq C\sqrt{\frac{f(N)}{N}}. \tag{1.8}$$

Notice that the above general strategy can be used with the logarithmic mean, because θ_2 is of the form (1.7) for the function $f(r) = r\log(r)$. In particular,

$$\mathrm{diam}_{\theta_2}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N)) \leq C\sqrt{\log(N)}. \tag{1.9}$$

If the interpolating function θ does not have the form (1.7) but is bounded from below by an interpolating function θ_f of the form (1.7), then we have

$$\mathrm{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N)) \leq \mathrm{diam}_{\theta_f}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N)) \leq C\sqrt{\frac{f(N)}{N}}.$$

This can be seen directly from the definitions given that the action $\mathcal{A}_N$ is monotone with respect to the interpolating function.

We finish this section by writing explicitly the continuity equation and the associated action in the geometric setting that is of interest. Indeed, the equation reads

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i) + \frac{1}{n\varepsilon_n^{d+1}}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(V_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i,\mathbf{x}_j) - V_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j,\mathbf{x}_i))\eta\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}_i-\mathbf{x}_j|}{\varepsilon_n}\right) = 0$$

and the corresponding action is

$$\mathcal{A}_n(\rho_{n,t},V_{n,t}) = \frac{1}{n^2\varepsilon_n^d}\sum_{i,j}\frac{(V_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i,\mathbf{x}_j))^2}{\theta(\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i),\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j))}\eta\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}_i-\mathbf{x}_j|}{\varepsilon_n}\right).$$

Remark 1.14. We notice that $\mathcal{P}(X_n)$ can be considered naturally as a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, so that in particular we may compute $W(\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n)$ for two measures $\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n \in \mathcal{P}(X_n)$. Nevertheless, we remark that most of the times we will consider $\mathcal{P}(X_n)$ endowed with the discrete Wasserstein distance as defined in this section.

1.5. **Gromov-Hausdorff distance.** In this section we consider $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ and $(\mathcal{Y}, d_{\mathcal{Y}})$ two arbitrary metric spaces and define its Gromov-Hasudorff distance. We do this via the notion of correspondences and refer the interested reader to Chapter 7.3 in [3] for a more complete discussion on the matter.

Definition 1.15. *A correspondence $\mathfrak{R}$ between $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ is a subset of the cartesian product $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ there exists $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ for which $(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}$ and also for every $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ there exists $x \in \mathcal{X}$ for which $(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}$.*

Definition 1.16. *Given a correspondence $\mathfrak{R}$ between $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$, we define its distortion $dis\mathfrak{R}$ by*

$$dis\mathfrak{R} := \sup|d_{\mathcal{X}}(x, x') - d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y, y')|,$$

where the sup *is taken over all pairs $(x, y), (x', y') \in \mathfrak{R}$.*

Definition 1.17. *The Gromov-Hausdorff distance between $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ is defined by*

$$d_{GH}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) := \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\mathfrak{R}} dis\mathfrak{R},$$

where the infimum is taken over all correspondences $\mathfrak{R}$ between $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$.

Finally, we say that a sequence of metric spaces $\{(\mathcal{X}_n, d_{\mathcal{X}_n})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense towards $(\mathcal{X}, d_{\mathcal{X}})$ as $n \to \infty$ (and write $\mathcal{X}_n \xrightarrow{GH} \mathcal{X}$), if

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} d_{GH}(\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}) = 0.$$

Remark 1.18. Despite the fact that we are using the word "distance" to refer to d_{GH} it is important to remark that there are two obstructions for being able to use the terminology in the usual sense. First, there is a set theoretic obstruction because we can not talk about the "set of all metric spaces". On the other hand, even if we could talk about such set, d_{GH} would only be a distance on the set of isometry classes of metric spaces. Both of the above obstructions can be avoided if one considers the space of isometry classes of compact metric spaces.

One way to estimate the Gromov-Hausdorff distance between two metric spaces is to find a ϱ-isometry between them.

Definition 1.19. *A map $F : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ is called a ϱ-isometry if*

(1) $\sup_{x,x' \in \mathcal{X}} |d_{\mathcal{Y}}(F(x), F(x')) - d_{\mathcal{X}}(x, x')| \leq \varrho$
(2) For every $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ there exists $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $d_{\mathcal{Y}}(y, F(x)) \leq \varrho$.

The first condition says that the distortion of F is at most ϱ, and the second condition says that the set $F(\mathcal{X})$ is an ϱ-net in $(\mathcal{Y}, d_{\mathcal{Y}})$.

It is then straightforward to check that if one can find a ϱ-isometry between $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$, then

$$d_{GH}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \leq 2\varrho.$$

From this observation it follows that it suffices to construct a ϱ-isometry between two metric spaces to bound their Gromov-Hausdorff distance.

1.6. **Main results.** The main result of the paper is the following.

Theorem 1.20. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let X_n be a subset of $\mathbb{T}^d$ with cardinality n and denote by ν_n the empirical measure associated to X_n. Let T_n be the optimal, in the ∞-OT sense, transportation map between ν (the uniform distribution on $\mathbb{T}^d$) and ν_n ,and let δ_n be*

$$\delta_n := \|T_n - Id\|_\infty.$$

We assume that $\delta_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Let η be as in (1.3) and construct the distance W_n on $\mathcal{P}(X_n)$ as in Definition 1.10 where θ satisfies conditions (1)-(6) in Subsection 1.4 and ε_n satisfies

$$\varepsilon_n \to 0, \quad \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n} \to 0, \quad \varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{N}})) \to 0, \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty, \tag{1.10}$$

where $\operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{N}}))$ is the diameter of the discrete Wasserstein space on the complete graph with $N = n\epsilon_n^d$ points as defined in Example 1.13. Then,

$$(\mathcal{P}(X_n), W_n) \xrightarrow{GH} (\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_d \sigma_\eta}} W), \quad \text{as } n \to \infty,$$

where α_d is the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$, σ_η is as in (1.4) and W is the Wasserstein metric on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$.

In particular, when the interpolating function θ is the logarithmic mean, the required scalings for ε_n read

$$\varepsilon_n \to 0, \quad \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n} \to 0, \quad \varepsilon_n \sqrt{\log(n\varepsilon_n^d)} \to 0, \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Corollary 1.21. *In the context of Theorem 1.20 suppose that $X_n = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$ where $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, \dots$ are i.i.d. random variables uniformly distributed on $\mathbb{T}^d$ where $d \geq 2$. Then with probability one,*

$$(\mathcal{P}(X_n), W_n) \xrightarrow{GH} (\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_d \sigma_\eta}} W), \quad \text{as } n \to \infty,$$

provided that

$$\varepsilon_n \to 0, \quad \frac{\log(n)^{p_d}}{n^{1/d}\varepsilon_n} \to 0, \quad \varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{N}})) \to 0, \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty,$$

where $p_2 = 3/4$ and $p_d = 1/d$ for $d \geq 3$.

The corollary follows directly from Theorem 1.20 and the rates of convergence of empirical measures in the ∞-OT distance studied in [10] (see also the references within).

Remark 1.22. We remark that as we had anticipated in Remark 1.3, Theorem 1.20 and its corollary still hold if the weights w_{ε_n} had been defined using any non-increasing, compactly supported kernel η. We also remark that from $\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n} \to 0$ it necessarily follows that $n\varepsilon_n^d \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ (see for example the first paragraphs in the proof of Proposition 2.10 below).

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **A priori estimates for the discrete Wasserstein distance.** In this section we establish some a priori estimates for the discrete Wasserstein distance that will be used in the sequel. In particular we show the following.

Proposition 2.1. *For every $\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n \in \mathcal{P}(X_n)$ we have*

$$W_n(\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n) \leq CW(\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n) + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N)),$$

where $N = n\varepsilon_n^d$, $\operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N))$ is the diameter of the discrete Wasserstein space from Example 1.13 and $C > 0$ is a constant that depends only on θ and d.

Remark 2.2. The above Proposition says that the discrete Wasserstein distance is controlled by the usual Wasserstein distance *plus* an extra term that we refer to as a *non-local effect* term. This non-local effect term appears because the geometry of the space $(\mathcal{P}(X_n), W_n)$ at the length-scale ε_n is essentially that of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N)$ from Example 1.13 (see Lemma 2.3 below). At larger scales the geometry of $\mathcal{P}(X_n)$ is reminiscent to the (local) Euclidean one. Notice that in Theorem 1.20 we have imposed conditions on how ε_n should decay to zero so as to guarantee that the non-local effect vanishes in the limit.

Let us introduce some notation that is used in the rest of the section. For every $i = 1, \dots, n$ let $\mu_n^i \in \mathcal{P}(X_n)$ be the uniform distribution on $B(\mathbf{x}_i, \varepsilon_n/8) \cap X_n$. We let $X^i := \mathrm{supp}(\mu_n^i)$ and let N_i be the number of elements in X^i. Observe that thanks to the assumption $\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n} \to 0$ we have

$$cn\varepsilon_n^d \leq N_i \leq Cn\varepsilon_n^d, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n \tag{2.1}$$

where c, C are constants independent of n. We split the proof of Proposition 2.1 into three lemmas.

Lemma 2.3. *For every $i = 1, \dots, n$ we have*

$$W_n(\delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}, \mu_n^i) \leq C\varepsilon_n \,\mathrm{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{N_i})),$$

where C is a constant independent of i or n, and where $\mathrm{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{N_i}))$ is defined in Example 1.13.

Proof. Consider the point cloud X^i. Notice that

$$\omega_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n^d}, \quad \forall \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in X^i$$

and in particular the weighted graph $(X^i, \omega_{\varepsilon_n})$ is simply a rescaled version of the complete graph on N_i elements. This suggests that in order to estimate $W_n(\delta_i, \mu_n^i)$ we should compute the action of a rescaled version of a geodesic in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{N_i})$ connecting a point mass with the uniform distribution on X^i. Consider then a curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\tilde{\rho}_t, \tilde{V}_t)$ with $\tilde{\rho}_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{N_i})$ for all $t \in [0,1]$, with $\tilde{\rho}_0$ the density of a point mass at $\mathbf{x}_i$, with $\tilde{\rho}_1$ the density of the uniform distribution on X^i, satisfying the continuity equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{\rho}_t(\mathbf{y}) + \frac{1}{N_i}\sum_{\mathbf{z} \in X^i} (\tilde{V}_t(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) - \tilde{V}_t(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})) = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{y} \in X^i$$

and whose corresponding total action is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{N_i^2}\sum_{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in X^i} \int_0^1 \frac{\tilde{V}_t(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})^2}{\theta(\tilde{\rho}_t(\mathbf{y}), \tilde{\rho}_t(\mathbf{z}))} dt \leq \mathrm{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{N_i}))^2.$$

We define $\rho_{n,t} \in \mathcal{P}(X_n)$ by

$$\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{y}) := \frac{n\tilde{\rho}_t(\mathbf{y})}{N_i}, \quad \mathbf{y} \in X^i,$$

and we set $\rho_{n,t}$ to be zero outside of X^i. Similarly, we define the discrete vector field $V_{n,t}$ by

$$V_{n,t}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) := \frac{n^2\varepsilon_n^{d+1}}{N_i^2}\tilde{V}_t(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}), \quad (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in X^i \times X^i,$$

and we set $V_{n,t}$ to be zero outside of $X^i \times X^i$. With these definitions it is then straightforward to check that $t \mapsto (\rho_{n,t}, V_{n,t})$ satisfies the discrete continuity equation, that $\rho_{n,0}$ corresponds to the discrete density of $\delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}$, that $\rho_{n,1}$ corresponds to the discrete density of μ_n^i and finally that

$$W_n^2(\delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}, \mu_n^i) \leq \int_0^1 \mathcal{A}_n(\rho_{n,t}, V_{n,t}) dt \leq \left(\frac{n\varepsilon_n^d}{N_i}\right)\varepsilon_n^2(\mathrm{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{K}_{N_i}))^2 \leq C\varepsilon_n^2(\mathrm{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{K}_{N_i}))^2,$$

where the last inequality follows from (2.1). The desired estimate now follows.

□

As we will see, the above estimate allows us to bound the distance $W_n(\delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}, \delta_{\mathbf{x}_j})$ in case the points $\mathbf{x}_i$ and $\mathbf{x}_j$ are within distance ε_n from each other. On the other hand, the next lemmas will allow us to estimate $W_n(\delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}, \delta_{\mathbf{x}_j})$ for points $\mathbf{x}_i$, $\mathbf{x}_j$ that are far away from each other; we use a discretization of the Euclidean shortest path connecting the points.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\hat{\alpha}$ be the real number in $[0, \pi/2]$ for which $\sin(\hat{\alpha}) = 1/8$. Let $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$ and let $\vec{u}$ be a unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Consider the set*

$$\mathcal{C}_n(x, \vec{u}) := \{y \in \mathbb{T}^d \, : \, \frac{\varepsilon_n}{4} < |y - x| < \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2}, \quad \alpha_y \in [0, \hat{\alpha}]\},$$

where α_y is the angle between the vectors $(y - x)$ and $\vec{u}$. Then,

$$\mathcal{C}_n(x, \vec{u}) \cap X_n \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof. To show this, let $\tilde{x} := x + \frac{3\varepsilon_n}{8}\vec{u}$. It is straightforward to see that

$$dist(\tilde{x}, \partial\mathcal{C}_n) \geq \frac{3\varepsilon_n}{8}\sin(\hat{\alpha})\varepsilon_n \geq \frac{\varepsilon_n}{24} > \delta_n,$$

where the last inequality follows from the assumptions on ε_n. If $X_n \cap \mathcal{C}_n(x, \vec{u})$ was the empty set, this would contradict the fact that δ_n is the ∞-transportation distance between ν and ν_n. $\square$

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j \in X_n$ be such that $|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j| < \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2}$. Then,*

$$W_n(\mu_n^i, \mu_n^j) \leq C_\theta \varepsilon_n,$$

for some finite constant $C_\theta > 0$ that depends on the interpolating function θ.

Proof. By Lemma 2.4 and the triangle inequality it is enough to prove the result under the extra condition that $\frac{\varepsilon_n}{4} < |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|$; this extra assumption simplifies the computations that follow, given that in this case we have $X^i \cap X^j = \emptyset$ (i.e. the supports of the measures μ_n^i and μ_n^j are disjoint). The path connecting μ_n^i and μ_n^j that we consider is such that at every point in time, the mass in X^i is uniformly distributed and likewise for X^j. The way the mass is transported between the "blubs" X^i and X^j is as in the 2-point space from Section 2 in [15]. Points in X_n outside of $X^i \cup X^j$ play no role in our transportation scheme.

Indeed, by taking $p = q = 1/2$ in Lemma 2.3 and Theorem 2.4 in [15], it follows that there exist differentiable functions $\gamma : [0, 1] \to [-1, 1]$ and $\chi : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\gamma_0 = -1, \quad \gamma_1 = 1,$$

$$\gamma_t' = \frac{1}{4}\theta(1 + \gamma_t, 1 - \gamma_t)\chi_t, \quad \forall t \in (0, 1),$$

and

$$\int_0^1 \chi_t^2 \theta(1 + \gamma_t, 1 - \gamma_t)dt < \infty.$$

We notice that assumption (6) on θ is crucial for this to be true. Now, for every $t \in [0, 1]$ set

$$\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{n(1 - \gamma_t)}{2N_i}, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in X^i$$

$$\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{n(1 + \gamma_t)}{2N_j}, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in X^j$$

and set $\rho_{n,t}$ to be zero outside of $X^i \cup X^j$. Then, a straightforward computation shows that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathrm{div}_n(V_{n,t})(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in X_n,$$

where

$$V_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \begin{cases} \frac{n^2\varepsilon_n^{d+1}}{16N_iN_j}\theta(1 + \gamma_t, 1 - \gamma_t)\chi_t & (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in X^i \times X^j \\ -V_{n,t}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) & (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in X^j \times X^i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In the above computation we use the fact that for every $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \in X^i \cap X^j$ we have $\omega_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n}$ (which follows from the assumption $|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j| < \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2}$ and the definitions of X^i and X^j). The curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto\to (\rho_{n,t}, V_{n,t})$ is thus a solution to the discrete continuity equation connecting the measures μ_n^i and μ_n^j. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} W_n^2(\mu_n^i,\mu_n^j) \le \int_0^1 \mathcal{A}_n(\rho_t,V_t)dt &= \frac{2}{n^2\varepsilon_n^d}\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in X^i}\sum_{\mathbf{y}\in X^j}\frac{n^4\varepsilon_n^{2(d+1)}}{16^2N_i^2N_j^2}\int_0^1 \frac{\theta(1+\gamma_t,1-\gamma_t)^2}{\theta(\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}),\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{y}))}\chi_t^2 dt \\ &\le C\frac{n\varepsilon_n^d\varepsilon_n^2\max\{N_i,N_j\}}{N_iN_j}\int_0^1 \theta(1+\gamma_t,1-\gamma_t)\chi_t^2 dt \\ &\le C\varepsilon_n^2\int_0^1 \theta(1+\gamma_t,1-\gamma_t)\chi_t^2 dt, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we have used the homogeneity and monotonicity of θ to write

$$\frac{1}{\theta(\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}),\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{y}))} \le \frac{2\max\{N_i,N_j\}}{n}\frac{1}{\theta(1+\gamma_t,1-\gamma_t)},$$

and in the last inequality we have used (2.1). The desired inequality follows. □

We are now in a position to establish Proposition 2.1.

Proof of Proposition (2.1). **Step 1:** We first establish the result in the case in which $\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n$ are arbitrary point masses $\mu_n := \delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}$, $\tilde{\mu}_n := \delta_{\mathbf{x}_j}$. We claim that there exists a sequence $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k$ in X_n satisfying the following properties:

(1) $x_0 = \mathbf{x}_i$, $x_k = \mathbf{x}_j$.
(2) $|x_{l+1} - \mathbf{x}_j| < |x_l - \mathbf{x}_j|$ for every l.
(3) $\frac{1}{2}|x_l - x_{l+1}| \le |x_l - \mathbf{x}_j| - |x_{l+1} - \mathbf{x}_j|$ for every l.
(4) $x_{l+1} \in \mathcal{C}_n(x, \frac{\mathbf{x}_j - x_l}{|\mathbf{x}_j - x_l|})$ for every $l = 0, \dots, k-2$.
(5) $|x_{k-1} - \mathbf{x}_j| < \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2}$,

where $\mathcal{C}_n$ is as in Lemma 2.4.

To see this, first set $x_0 := \mathbf{x}_i$. If $|x_0 - \mathbf{x}_j| < \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2}$ then we simply set $x_1 = \mathbf{x}_j$ and stop the construction. Otherwise, we know by Lemma 2.4 that there exists $x_1 \in \mathcal{C}_n(x_0, \frac{\mathbf{x}_j - x_0}{|\mathbf{x}_j - x_0|}) \cap X_n$. We claim that

$$\frac{1}{2}|x_0 - x_1| \le |x_0 - \mathbf{x}_j| - |x_1 - \mathbf{x}_j|. \tag{2.2}$$

Indeed, notice that if $|x_0 - x_1| > 4|x_1 - \mathbf{x}_j|$ then,

$$\frac{1}{2}|x_0 - x_1| < |x_0 - x_1| - 2|x_1 - \mathbf{x}_j| \le |x_1 - \mathbf{x}_j| + |\mathbf{x}_j - x_0| - 2|x_1 - \mathbf{x}_j| = |x_0 - \mathbf{x}_j| - |x_1 - \mathbf{x}_j|,$$

and so (2.2) holds in this case. On the other hand, if $|x_0 - x_1| \le 4|x_1 - \mathbf{x}_j|$ we may consider the triangle in the figure below and notice that



$$\cos(\theta_2) = \frac{\sin(\alpha)|x_0 - x_1|}{|x_1 - \mathbf{x}_j|} \leq 4\sin(\alpha) \leq 1/2,$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\sin(\alpha) \leq 1/8$ given that $x_1 \in \mathcal{C}_n(x_0, \frac{\mathbf{x}_j - x_0}{|\mathbf{x}_j - x_0|})$; in particular $\theta_2 \geq \pi/3$. It follows that $0 \leq \beta = \pi - \theta_1 - \theta_2 = \frac{\pi}{2} + \alpha - \theta_2 \leq \frac{\pi}{2} + \frac{\pi}{6} - \frac{\pi}{3} = \frac{\pi}{3}$ and thus

$$\cos(\beta) \geq \cos(\pi/3) = 1/2.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{2}|x_0 - x_1| + |x_1 - \mathbf{x}_j| \leq \cos(\beta)|x_0 - x_1| + |x_1 - \mathbf{x}_j| \leq |x_0 - \mathbf{x}_j|.$$

This establishes (2.2).

We continue constructing the sequence $x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots$ obtaining x_{l+1} from x_l in the same way we obtained x_1 from x_0. Given that $|x_l - \mathbf{x}_j|$ decreases at every new step and given that X_n is finite, we conclude that after a finite number of steps our construction will arrive to $\mathbf{x}_j$.

Now for every $l = 0, \ldots, k$ let μ_n^l be the uniform distribution on $B(x_l, \frac{\varepsilon_n}{8}) \cap X_n$. We can then use the properties of the path $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_k$ and Lemma 2.5 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
W_n(\mu_n^0, \mu_n^k) &\leq \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} W_n(\mu_n^l, \mu_n^{l+1}) \\
&\leq C_\theta \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \varepsilon_n \\
&\leq 4C_\theta \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} |x_l - x_{l+1}| + C_\theta \varepsilon_n \\
&\leq \frac{8C_\theta}{2} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} |x_l - x_{l+1}| + C_\theta \varepsilon_n \\
&\leq 8C_\theta \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} |x_l - x_{l+1}| + \frac{1}{2}|x_{k-1} - x_k| \right) + C_\theta \varepsilon_n \\
&\leq 8C_\theta \left(\sum_{l=0}^{k-2} (|x_l - \mathbf{x}_j| - |x_{l+1} - \mathbf{x}_j|) + |x_{k-1} - x_k| \right) + C_\theta \varepsilon_n, \\
&= 8C_\theta |x_0 - \mathbf{x}_j| + C_\theta \varepsilon_n
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that the sum in the second to last line is telescoping. Finally, the triangle inequality, the above estimate, Lemma 2.3 and (2.1) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
W_n(\delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}, \delta_{\mathbf{x}_j}) &\leq W_n(\delta_{x_0}, \mu_n^0) + W_n(\mu_n^0, \mu_n^k) + W_n(\mu_n^k, \delta_{x_k}) \\
&\leq C_\theta |x_0 - \mathbf{x}_j| + C_\theta \varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N)) \\
&= C_\theta W(\delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}, \delta_{\mathbf{x}_j}) + C_\theta \varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N)),
\end{aligned}$$

where we recall $N = n\varepsilon_n^d$.

Step 2: For general $\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n \in \mathcal{P}(X_n)$ it is straightforward to check that

$$W_n^2(\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n) \leq \min_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n)} \int \int W_n^2(\delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}, \delta_{\mathbf{x}_j}) d\pi(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j);$$

see for example Proposition 2.14 in [9] . Recall that for the Wasserstein distance we have

$$W^2(\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n) = \min_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n)} \int \int |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|^2 d\pi(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j).$$

Hence, we may use Step 1 to conclude that

$$W_n(\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n) \leq CW(\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n) + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_\mathrm{N})),$$

for some constant $C > 0$ only depending on d, and θ; this establishes the desired result. □

We finish this section with two results that give us some bounds on the distances W (or W_n) between measures with densities with respect to Lebesgue measure (or discrete densities) that are bounded below by a positive constant, in terms of the L^∞-distance of the densities. For densities with respect to the Lebesgue measure the result follows directly from a result in [10], whereas for discrete densities the results is a consequence of Proposition 2.1.

Lemma 2.6. *Let ρ_0 and ρ_1 be two densities with respect to ν, satisfying that*

$$0 < a \leq \rho, \tilde{\rho} \leq M.$$

Then,

$$W(\rho dx, \tilde{\rho} dx) \leq C \left(\frac{1}{a} + M\right) \|\rho - \tilde{\rho}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)}.$$

Proof. The result follows immediately from the proof of Theorem 1.2 in [10] by noticing that any two measures in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ can be seen as measures in $\mathcal{P}([0,1]^d)$ and that their Wasserstein distance in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is below that in $\mathcal{P}([0,1]^d)$. □

Lemma 2.7. *Let ρ_n and $\tilde{\rho}_n$ be two discrete densities and assume that*

$$0 < a \leq \rho_n(\mathbf{x}_i), \tilde{\rho}_n(\mathbf{x}_i) \leq M, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then,

$$W_n(\rho_n, \tilde{\rho}_n) \leq C \left(\frac{1}{a} + M\right) \|\rho_n - \tilde{\rho}_n\|_{L^\infty(\nu_n)} + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_\mathrm{N})).$$

Proof. Let T_n be the optimal, in the ∞-OT sense, transportation map between ν and ν_n. For every $i = 1, \dots, n$ we let $U_i := T_n^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_i)$. Notice that all the sets U_i have ν measure equal to $1/n$ and that the distance between $\mathbf{x}_i$ and any point in U_i is smaller than δ_n (the ∞-OT distance between ν and ν_n).

Consider now two discrete densities $\rho_n, \tilde{\rho}_n$ as in the statement. We construct measures in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with densities

$$\rho(x) := \rho_n(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad \forall x \in U_i, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n,$$
$$\tilde{\rho}(x) := \tilde{\rho}_n(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad \forall x \in U_i, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n.$$

We denote by $\mu, \tilde{\mu}$ the measures $\rho(x)dx$ and $\tilde{\rho}(x)dx$ respectively, and denote by μ_n and $\tilde{\mu}_n$ the measures with discrete densities ρ_n and $\tilde{\rho}_n$ respectively. Note that

$$W(\mu_n, \mu) \leq \delta_n \quad \text{and} \quad W(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\mu}) \leq \delta_n,$$

because one can transport one of the measures into the other by redistributing the mass within each of the cells U_i. On the other hand, from Lemma 2.6 we know that

$$W(\mu, \tilde{\mu}) \leq C \left(\frac{1}{a} + M\right) \|\rho - \tilde{\rho}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)} = C \left(\frac{1}{a} + M\right) \|\rho_n - \tilde{\rho}_n\|_{L^\infty(X_n)}.$$

Hence, from Proposition (2.1) we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} W_n(\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n) &\leq CW(\mu_n, \tilde{\mu}_n) + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_\mathrm{N})) \\ &\leq CW(\mu_n, \mu) + CW(\mu, \tilde{\mu}) + CW(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\mu}_n) + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_\mathrm{N})) \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{1}{a} + M\right) \|\rho_n - \tilde{\rho}_n\|_{L^\infty(X_n)} + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_\mathrm{N})), \end{aligned}$$

where we have also used the fact that $\delta_n \leq \varepsilon_n$. □

2.2. **Smoothening step in continuous setting.** The purpose of this section is to present some basic results which say that starting from a solution $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\mu_t, \vec{V}_t)$ to the continuity equation, we may obtain more regular solutions to the continuity equation that have smaller total action than the original solution. This is accomplished by standard mollification arguments.

Let $\{\mathbf{H}_s\}_{s>0}$ be the heat semigroup on $\mathbb{T}^d$. For an arbitrary $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the convolution $\mathbf{H}_s(\mu)$ is the measure whose density ρ_s with respect to the Lebesgue measure is given by

$$\rho_s(x) := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} J_s(y-x)d\mu(y) = J_s * \mu(x),$$

where in the above and in the remainder, $y-x$ has to be interpreted modulo $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and J_s denotes the Heat kernel

$$J_s(u) := \frac{1}{(4\pi s)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{|u|^2}{4s}\right).$$

Let $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\mu_t, \vec{V}_t)$ be a solution to the continuity equation and let $s > 0$. Consider $\mu_t^s := \mathbf{H}_s(\mu_t)$ and let $\vec{V}_t^s$ be the density of the vector valued measure $\mathbf{H}_s(\vec{V}_t\mu_t) := J_s * (\vec{V}_t\mu_t)$. Then, the curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\mu_t^s, \vec{V}_t^s)$ satisfies the continuity equation in flux form:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mu_t^s + \operatorname{div}(\vec{V}_t^s) = 0.$$

The proof of this statement can be found in [1]. For the convenience of the reader, we point out that the proof relies on the fact that $\mathbf{H}_s$ is a convolution type operator and so for arbitrary $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \vec{V}_t^h(x) \cdot \nabla\phi(x)dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} J_s(z-x)\vec{V}_t(z)\cdot\nabla\phi(x)d\mu_t(z)dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} J_s(z-x)\nabla\phi(x)dx\right)\cdot\vec{V}_t(z)d\mu_t(z) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (J_s * \nabla\phi)(z)\cdot\vec{V}_t(z)d\mu_t(z) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \vec{V}_t(z)\cdot\nabla(J_s*\phi)(z)d\mu_t(z),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\nabla_z J_s(z-x) = -\nabla_x J_s(z-x)$ which guarantees that $(J_s * \nabla\phi)(z) = \nabla(J_s*\phi)(z)$. On the other hand, at the level of the measures, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\phi(x)d\mu_t^s(x) = \frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}(J_s*\phi)(x)d\mu_t(x),$$

which together with (2.3) imply that indeed $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\mu_t^s, \vec{V}_t^s)$ satisfies the continuity equation in flux form.

By convolving a solution to the continuity equation with the heat kernel we obtain more regular measures and vector fields. In the next two propositions we summarize some facts that we need in the sequel.

Proposition 2.8. *(Heat flow on $\mathbb{T}^d$). The following assertions hold for every $s > 0$:*

(1) There exists constants $c_1(s) > 0$ and $C_2(s) < \infty$ such that for every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the density ρ_s of $\mathbf{H}_s(\mu)$ satisfies

$$\rho_s \geq c_1(s) \quad \text{and } \operatorname{Lip}(\rho_s) \leq C_2(s).$$

(2) For every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ we have

$$W(\mu, \mathbf{H}_s(\mu)) \leq \sqrt{2ds}.$$

(3) There exists a constant $C_3(s) < \infty$ such that for any $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ we have

$$\|\mathbf{H}_s(f)\|_\infty + \operatorname{Lip}(\mathbf{H}_s(f)) + \|D^2\mathbf{H}_s(f)\|_\infty \leq C_3(s)\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)}$$

(4) Let $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\mu_t, \vec{V}_t)$ be a geodesic in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ (w.r.t. the Wasserstein distance). Let $\rho_{s,t}$ be the density of $\mathbf{H}_s(\mu_t)$ and $\vec{V}_{s,t}$ be the density of the vector valued measure $\mathbf{H}_s(\vec{V}_t\mu_t)$. Then, the curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\rho_{s,t}, \vec{V}_{s,t})$ is a solution to the continuity equation in flux form and we have

$$\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{|\vec{V}_{s,t}(x)|^2}{\rho_{s,t}(x)} dxdt \leq W(\mu_0, \mu_1))^2.$$

Proof. This result and its proof appear in [13]. We notice that (2) follows from Lemma 7.1.10 in [1] by noticing that the Waserstein distance between μ and $\mathbf{H}_s * \mu$ seen as measures on the torus is smaller than the Wasserstein distance of μ and $\mathbf{H}_s * \mu$ seen as measures on $[0,1]^d$; the value of the constant on the right hand side of the inequality was obtained using well known identities for a Gaussian. □

Proposition 2.9. *Consider a solution to the continuity equation $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\mu_t, \vec{V}_t)$ and for $s > 0$ consider $\vec{V}_t^s$ the density of the vector valued measure $\mathbf{H}_s(\vec{V}_t\mu_t)$. Then, there exists a constant $C_4(s)$ such that*

$$\int_0^1 \left(\|\vec{V}_t^s\|_\infty + \mathrm{Lip}(\vec{V}_t^s) + \|D^2\vec{V}_t^s\|_\infty \right) dt \leq C_4(s) \left(\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\vec{V}_t(x)|^2 d\mu_t(x) dt \right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. As in (3) in Proposition 2.8 (from the definition of convolution) we can obtain that

$$\int_0^1 \left(\|\vec{V}_t^s\|_\infty + \mathrm{Lip}(\vec{V}_t^s) + \|D^2\vec{V}_t^s\|_\infty \right) dt \leq C_4(s) \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\vec{V}_t(x)| d\mu_t(x) dt.$$

A simple application of Jensen's inequality implies the desired result. □

2.3. **Smoothening step in discrete setting.** The main results in the previous section stated that starting from an arbitrary solution $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\mu_t, \vec{V}_t)$ to the continuity equation, we could construct a more regular solution whose total action is below that of the original curve. Our goal for this section is to establish a somewhat analogue result in the discrete setting. It will be convenient to introduce some notation that we use in the sequel.

Let T_n be the optimal transportation map, in the ∞-OT sense, between ν and ν_n. We introduce a map

$$P_n : \mathcal{P}(X_n) \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$$

that associates to every discrete density $\rho_n \in \mathcal{P}(X_n)$ a density $\rho(x)$ (with respect to ν) satisfying

$$\rho(x) := \rho_n(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad x \in U_i,$$

where $U_i = T_n^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_i)$. In particular, the density ρ is constant in each of the sets U_i.

Proposition 2.10. *Suppose that $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\rho_{n,t}, V_{n,t})$ is a solution to the discrete continuity equation. Then,there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all $c\delta_n < b < i_d$ (i.e. b smaller than the injectivity radius of $\mathbb{T}^d$, but no smaller than $c\delta_n$) there exists a curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\rho_{n,t}^b, V_{n,t}^b)$ satisfying the following:*

(1) (Continuity equation) For every $i = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_{n,t}^b(\mathbf{x}_i) + \mathrm{div}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(V_{n,t}^b)(\mathbf{x}_i) = 0$$

where

$$\mathrm{div}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(V_{n,t}^b)(\mathbf{x}_i) := \frac{1}{n\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} \sum_{j=1}^n (V_{n,t}^b(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) - V_{n,t}^b(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_i)) w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$$

and

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_n := \varepsilon_n + C_d\delta_n,$$

for a constant C_d only depending on dimension.

(2) (Action is almost decreased) The action,

$$\mathcal{A}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\rho^b_{n,t}, V^b_{n,t}) := \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i,j}\frac{(V^b_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i,\mathbf{x}_j))^2}{\theta(\rho^b_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i),\rho^b_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j))}w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i,\mathbf{x}_j)$$

satisfies

$$\mathcal{A}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\rho^b_{n,t}, V^b_{n,t}) \leq (1 + C_d\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n})\mathcal{A}_n(\rho_{n,t}, V_{n,t}), \quad \forall t \in [0,1].$$

(3) (Regularity of curves) For every i, j we have

$$|\rho^b_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \rho^b_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j)| \leq C_7(b)\left(|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j| + 2C_d\delta_n\right),$$

for a constant $C_7(b)$ that depends on b.

Moreover, if $M \geq \rho_{n,t} \geq a > 0$ for every $t \in [0,1]$, then the same lower and upper bounds hold for $\rho^b_{n,t}$ and in addition

$$W(P_n(\rho_{n,0}), P_n(\rho^b_{n,0})) \leq C\left(M + \frac{1}{a}\right)\mathrm{Lip}(\rho_{n,0})(b + \delta_n),$$

$$W(P_n(\rho_{n,1}), P_n(\rho^b_{n,1})) \leq C\left(M + \frac{1}{a}\right)\mathrm{Lip}(\rho_{n,1})(b + \delta_n),$$

where $M \geq \rho_{n,0}, \rho_{n,1} \geq a > 0$.

Let us point out the main difficulty in establishing this proposition. We recall that the smoothening step in the continuous setting was obtained by a simple mollification of probability measures and vector fields. These operations respected the continuity equation, and because they were of convolution type, Jensen's inequality guaranteed the desired relation for the action. In the geometric graph setting however, there is no a direct analogue to such procedure, partly because there is no obvious way to talk about coordinates of discrete vector fields. Our idea to go around this issue is as follows. We appropriately match the point cloud X_n with a set of points Y_B aligned on a regular grid on $\mathbb{T}^d$; we then conveniently map $\mathcal{P}(X_n)$ and $\mathfrak{X}(X_n)$ into $\mathcal{P}(Y_B)$ and $\mathfrak{X}(Y_B)$, do the convolution for discrete densities and vector fields on Y_B (exploiting the regular grid structure of Y_B) and finally map back to $\mathcal{P}(X_n)$ and $\mathfrak{X}(X_n)$.

Proof of Proposition 2.10 . Let B be the largest natural number below n of the form $B = \kappa^d$ for some natural number κ. We consider Y_B a set of B points in $\mathbb{T}^d$ forming a regular grid and denote by $\hat{\nu}_B$ the empirical measure associated to the points in Y_B. We can construct a transportation map $\hat{T}_B : \mathbb{T}^d \to Y_B$ satisfying

$$\hat{T}_{B\sharp}\nu = \hat{\nu}_B, \quad \|\hat{T}_B - Id\|_\infty \leq \frac{C_d}{B^{1/d}},$$

by orderly matching points in each of the cells induced by the regular grid with one of the points on the grid. From this, we conclude that

$$d_\infty(\hat{\nu}_B, \nu) \leq \frac{C_d}{B^{1/d}} \leq \frac{C_d}{n^{1/d}} \leq C_d\delta_n,$$

where the last inequality follows from Remark 1.2. Now, recall that $d_\infty(\nu, \nu_n) = \delta_n$. It follows from the triangle inequality that

$$d_\infty(\nu_n, \hat{\nu}_B) \leq C_d\delta_n.$$

In particular, there exists a transportation plan $\pi_n : X_n \times Y_B \to [0,1]$ between ν_n and $\hat{\nu}_B$ satisfying

$$|\mathbf{x}_i - y_k| \leq C_d\delta_n \text{ for all } \mathbf{x}_i \in X_n \text{ and } y_k \in Y_B \text{ with } \pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k) > 0.$$

Being a transportation plan between ν_n and $\hat{\nu}_B$, π_n satisfies

$$\sum_{k=1}^{B}\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k) = \frac{1}{n}, \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k) = \frac{1}{B}, \quad \forall k = 1, \dots, B.$$

For an arbitrary discrete density $\rho_n \in \mathcal{P}(X_n)$, we define an associated discrete density $\hat{\rho}_B \in \mathcal{P}(Y_B)$ (the set $\mathcal{P}(Y_B)$ is defined in the same way we defined $\mathcal{P}(X_n)$ using $\hat{\nu}_B$ as reference measure) by

$$\hat{\rho}_B(y_k) := B \sum_{i=1}^{n} \pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k) \rho_n(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad k = 1, \dots, B. \tag{2.4}$$

On the other hand, for a given discrete vector field $V_n \in \mathfrak{X}(X_n)$, we define an associated vector field $\hat{V}_B \in \mathfrak{X}(Y_B)$ by

$$\hat{V}_B(y_k, y_l) := \begin{cases} B^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k) \pi_n(\mathbf{x}_j, y_l) V_n(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \frac{w_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)}{w_{\hat{\varepsilon}_B}(y_k, y_l)}, & \text{if } w_{\hat{\varepsilon}_B}(y_k, y_l) > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where in the above

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_B := \varepsilon_n + 2C_d \delta_n.$$

Notice that from the definition of $\hat{\varepsilon}_B$ we conclude that if $\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k) > 0$, $\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_j, y_l) > 0$ and $w_{\hat{\varepsilon}_B}(y_k, y_l) = 0$, then $w_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = 0$ as well. Because of this we may write,

$$\hat{V}_B(y_k, y_l) = B^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k) \pi_n(\mathbf{x}_j, y_l) V_n(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \frac{w_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)}{w_{\hat{\varepsilon}_B}(y_k, y_l)}, \tag{2.5}$$

with the convention that $\frac{0}{0} = 0$. For the same reason, we can multiply both sides of the above equation by $w_{\hat{\varepsilon}_B}(y_k, y_l)$ and "cancel" the $w_{\hat{\varepsilon}_B}(y_k, y_l)$ term appearing in the denominator of the right hand side of the equation. We then notice that,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}_B(\hat{V}_B)(y_k) &:= \frac{1}{B\varepsilon_n} \sum_{l=1}^{B} \left(\hat{V}_B(y_k, y_l) - \hat{V}_B(y_l, y_k) \right) w_{\hat{\varepsilon}_B}(y_k, y_l) \\ &= \frac{B}{\varepsilon_n} \sum_{l=1}^{B} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k) \pi_n(\mathbf{x}_j, y_l) (V_n(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) - V_n(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_i)) w_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \\ &= \frac{B}{n\varepsilon_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} (V_n(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) - V_n(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_i)) w_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \right) \pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} B \pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k) \operatorname{div}_n(V_n)(\mathbf{x}_i). \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Therefore, if $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\rho_{n,t}, V_{n,t})$ satisfies the discrete continuity equation, then for all $k = 1, \dots, B$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \hat{\rho}_{B,t}(y_k) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} B \pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k) \frac{d}{dt} \rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i) \\ &= -\sum_{i=1}^{n} B \pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k) \operatorname{div}_n(V_{n,t})(\mathbf{x}_i) \\ &= -\operatorname{div}_B(\hat{V}_B)(y_k). \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Furthermore, the convexity of the function $(u,w,v)\mapsto \frac{v^2}{\theta(u,w)}$ and Jensen's inequality implies that

(2.8)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_B(\hat\rho_{B,t},\hat V_{B,t}) :=& \frac{1}{B^2}\sum_{k=1}^B\sum_{l=1}^B \frac{(\hat V_{B,t}(y_k,y_l))^2}{\theta(\hat\rho_{B,t}(y_k),\hat\rho_{B,t}(y_l))} w_{\hat\varepsilon_B}(y_k,y_l)\\
&\le \sum_{k,l}\sum_{i,j}\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i,y_k)\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_j,y_l)\frac{(V_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i,\mathbf{x}_j))^2}{\theta(\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i),\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j))}\frac{w_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x}_i,\mathbf{x}_j)}{w_{\hat\varepsilon_B}(y_k,y_l)} w_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x}_i,\mathbf{x}_j)\\
&\le \left(\frac{\hat\varepsilon_B}{\varepsilon_n}\right)^d \sum_{k,l}\sum_{i,j}\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i,y_k)\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_j,y_l)\frac{(V_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i,\mathbf{x}_j))^2}{\theta(\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i),\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j))} w_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x}_i,\mathbf{x}_j)\\
&= \frac{1}{n^2}\left(\frac{\hat\varepsilon_B}{\varepsilon_n}\right)^d \sum_{i,j}\frac{(V_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i,\mathbf{x}_j))^2}{\theta(\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i),\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j))} w_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x}_i,\mathbf{x}_j)\\
&= \left(\frac{\hat\varepsilon_B}{\varepsilon_n}\right)^d \mathcal{A}_n(\rho_{n,t},V_{n,t})\\
&\le (1+C_d\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n})\mathcal{A}_n(\rho_{n,t},V_{n,t}).
\end{aligned}$$

We now exploit the regular grid structure of Y_B to define mollified versions of discrete densities in $\mathcal{P}(X_n)$ and mollified versions of discrete vector fields in $\mathfrak{X}(X_n)$. The important aspect of the mollification operations that we introduce is that they are consistent with the discrete continuity equation (as long as we are willing to enlarge ε_n a bit). Let $G:\mathbb{R}^d\to[0,\infty)$ be a radial standard mollifier. That is, G is a radial smooth function with support in $B(0,1)$ which integrates to 1. In what follows we identify G with its radial profile. For $b<i_d$ (i_d being the injectivity radius of $\mathbb{T}^d$) we define

$$G_b(|x-y|) := \frac{1}{B\gamma_b b^d} G\left(\frac{|x-y|}{b}\right),$$

where γ_b is a constant introduced so as to guarantee that

$$\sum_{k=1}^B G_b(|y_k-y_m|)=1,\quad \forall m=1,\dots,B.$$

Notice that the map $m\mapsto\sum_{k=1}^B G_b(|y_k-y_m|)$ is indeed constant due to the regular grid structure of Y_B. Moreover, we can estimate γ_b easily, by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_b &= \frac{1}{B}\sum_{k=1}^B \frac{1}{b^d}G\left(\frac{|y_k-y_m|}{b}\right) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\frac{1}{b^d}G\left(\frac{|\hat T_B(x)-y_m|}{b}\right)dx\\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\frac{1}{b^d}G\left(\frac{|x-y_m|}{b}\right)dx + O\left(\frac{1}{B^{1/d}b}\right) = 1+O\left(\frac{1}{B^{1/d}b}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$|\gamma_b-1|\le C\frac{\delta_n}{b},$$

and we can take $c=2C$ in the statement of the proposition to guarantee that $1/2\le\gamma_b\le 2$; this is all that we need to know about γ_b for what follows.

Given $\rho_n\in\mathcal{P}(X_n)$ we define

$$\rho_n^b(\mathbf{x}_i) := n\sum_{k=1}^B\sum_{m=1}^B \pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i,y_k)G_b(|y_m-y_k|)\hat\rho_B(y_m).$$

Also, for a given $V_n \in \mathfrak{X}(X_n)$ we define $V_n^b \in \mathfrak{X}(X_n)$ by

$$V_n^b(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) := n^2 \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}{\varepsilon_n} \sum_{k=1}^{B}\sum_{l=1}^{B}\sum_{m=1}^{B} \hat{V}_B(y_m, y_m+(y_l-y_k))G_b(|y_m-y_k|)\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k)\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_j, y_l)\frac{w_{\hat{\varepsilon}_B}(y_m, y_m+(y_l-y_k))}{w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)},$$

where

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_n := \hat{\varepsilon}_B + 2C_d\delta_n.$$

As when we defined the vector field $\hat{V}_B$, we make the same observations regarding how to deal with the above expression in case $w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = 0$. On the other hand, notice that $y_m + (y_l - y_k)$ in the above formula indeed belongs to Y_B so that the expression $\hat{V}_B(y_m, y_m + (y_l - y_k))$ makes sense. Moreover, notice that for fixed m and k, the map $l \mapsto y_m + (y_l - y_k)$ is a parameterization of Y_B. In particular, we can actually write

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} V_n^b(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \frac{n^2\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}{B\varepsilon_n}\sum_{k=1}^{B}\sum_{m=1}^{B}\sum_{l=1}^{B} \hat{V}_B(y_m, y_l)G_b(|y_m - y_k|)\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k)w_{\hat{\varepsilon}_B}(y_m, y_l)$$

In addition, if we swap the roles of $\mathbf{x}_i$ and $\mathbf{x}_j$, using the regular grid structure of Y_B we can write after changing variables

$$V_n^b(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_i) = n^2 \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}{\varepsilon_n} \sum_{k=1}^{B}\sum_{l=1}^{B}\sum_{m=1}^{B} \hat{V}_B(y_m+(y_l-y_k), y_m)G_b(|y_m-y_k|)\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k)\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_j, y_l)\frac{w_{\hat{\varepsilon}_B}(y_m+(y_l-y_k), y_m)}{w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)}$$

and from this obtain that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} V_n^b(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_i)w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \frac{n^2\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}{B\varepsilon_n}\sum_{k=1}^{B}\sum_{m=1}^{B}\sum_{l=1}^{B} \hat{V}_B(y_l, y_m)G_b(|y_m - y_k|)\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k)w_{\hat{\varepsilon}_B}(y_m, y_l).$$

In particular, after straightforward computations we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{div}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(V_n^b)(\mathbf{x}_i) :=& \frac{1}{n\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(V_n^b(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) - V_n^b(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_i))w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)\\ &= n\sum_{k=1}^{B}\sum_{m=1}^{B}\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k)G_b(|y_m - y_k|)\operatorname{div}_B(\hat{V}_B)(y_m).\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

We conclude that if $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\rho_{n,t}, V_{n,t})$ is a solution to the discrete continuity equation, then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\rho_{n,t}^b(\mathbf{x}_i) &= \sum_{k=1}^{B}\sum_{m=1}^{B} n\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k)G_b(|y_m - y_k|)\frac{d}{dt}\hat{\rho}_{B,t}(y_m)\\ &= -\sum_{k=1}^{B}\sum_{m=1}^{B} n\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k)G_b(|y_m - y_k|)\operatorname{div}_B(\hat{V}_{B,t})(y_m)\\ &= -\operatorname{div}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(V_n^b)(\mathbf{x}_i),\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

proving in this way the first part of the proposition.

To estimate the action of the resulting curve $t \mapsto (\rho_{n,t}^b, V_{n,t}^b)$ fix i, j and notice that

$$\rho_{n,t}^b(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{k=1}^{B}\sum_{l=1}^{B}\sum_{m=1}^{B} n^2\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k)\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_j, y_l)G_b(|y_m - y_k|)\hat{\rho}_B(y_m)$$

and also, that for every $k = 1, \dots, B$

$$\rho_{n,t}^b(\mathbf{x}_j) = \sum_{l=1}^{B}\sum_{m=1}^{B} n\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_j, y_l)G_b(|y_m - y_k|)\hat{\rho}_B(y_m + (y_l - y_k))$$

which in particular implies that

$$\rho^b_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j) = \sum_{k=1}^{B}\sum_{l=1}^{B}\sum_{m=1}^{B} n^2\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k)\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_j, y_l)G_b(|y_m - y_k|)\hat{\rho}_B(y_m + (y_l - y_k)).$$

From the previous identities for $\rho^b_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i), \rho^b_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j)$, the definition of $V^b_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$, the convexity of the function $(u, v, w) \mapsto \frac{v^2}{\theta(u,w)}$, and Jensen's inequality we conclude by carrying out similar computations to those in (2.8) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\rho^b_{n,t}, V^b_{n,t}) &:= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i,j}\frac{(V^b_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j))^2}{\theta(\rho^b_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i), \rho^b_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j))}w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)\\ &\leq \left(\frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}{\hat{\varepsilon}_B}\right)^d\left(\frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}{\varepsilon_n}\right)^2\mathcal{A}_B(\hat{\rho}_{B,t}, \hat{V}_{B,t}).\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Combining this inequality with (2.8), we obtain

$$\mathcal{A}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\rho^b_{n,t}, V^b_{n,t}) \leq (1 + C_d\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n})\mathcal{A}_n(\rho_{n,t}, V_{n,t}), \tag{2.12}$$

establishing in this way the second part of the proposition.

Regarding the regularity of the densities $\rho^b_{n,t}$, we notice that from the definitions, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}|\rho^b_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j) - \rho^b_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i)| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{B}\sum_{l=1}^{B}\sum_{m=1}^{B} n^2\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_j, y_l)\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k)|G_b(|y_l - y_m|) - G_b(|y_k - y_m|)|\hat{\rho}_{B,t}(y_m)\\ &\leq C_7(b)\left(|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j| + 2C_d\delta_n\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $C_7(b)$ is a constant only depending on b.

To show the last part of the proposition let us assume that $\rho_{n,t} \geq a > 0$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$. Botice that from the definition of $\hat{\rho}_{B,t}$ and $\rho^b_{n,t}$ it follows that $\rho^b_{n,t} \geq a > 0$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$. On the other hand, for every $i = 1, \ldots, n$

$$\begin{aligned}|\rho_{n,0}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \rho^b_{n,0}(\mathbf{x}_i)| &= \left|\sum_{k=1}^{B}\sum_{m=1}^{B}\sum_{j=1}^{n} nB\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k)\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_j, y_m)G_b(|y_m - y_k|)(\rho_{n,0}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \rho_{n,0}(\mathbf{x}_j))\right|\\ &\leq \mathrm{Lip}(\rho_{n,0})\sum_{k=1}^{B}\sum_{m=1}^{B}\sum_{j=1}^{n} nB\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_i, y_k)\pi_n(\mathbf{x}_j, y_m)G_b(|y_m - y_k|)|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|\\ &\leq \mathrm{Lip}(\rho_{n,0})(b + 2C_d\delta_n)\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that G_b vanishes if its argument is greater than b. In other words, $\|\rho_{n,0} - \rho^b_{n,0}\|_{L^\infty(\nu_n)} \leq \mathrm{Lip}(\rho_{n,0})(b + 2C_d\delta_n)$. Now, let ρ_0 and ρ^b_0 be the densities of $P_n(\rho_{n,0})$ and $P_n(\rho^b_{n,0})$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure. We observe that the lower and upper bounds for $\rho_{n,0}$ and $\rho^b_{n,0}$ are the same lower and upper bounds for ρ_0 and ρ^b_0. Moreover, $\|\rho_0 - \rho^b_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)} = \|\rho_{n,0} - \rho^b_{n,0}\|_{L^\infty(\nu_n)}$. From these facts and Lemma 2.6 we conclude that

$$W(P_n(\rho_{n,0}), P_n(\rho^b_{n,0})) \leq C\left(M_0 + \frac{1}{a}\right)\mathrm{Lip}(\rho_{n,0})(b + \delta_n).$$

In exactly the same way, we obtain

$$W_n(P_n(\rho_{n,1}), P_n(\rho^b_{n,1})) \leq C\left(M_1 + \frac{1}{a}\right)\mathrm{Lip}(\rho_{n,1})(b + \delta_n).$$

□

Our goal now is to construct solutions to the discrete continuity equation that are bounded away from zero. We first need a discrete version of Poincare inequality.

Lemma 2.11. *(Poincare inequality in discrete setting). For all $f_n \in L^2(\nu_n)$ with $\langle f_n, \mathbb{1}\rangle_{L^2(\nu_n)} = 0$ we have*

$$\|f_n\|^2_{L^2(\nu_n)} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_n} D_n(f_n) \leq C_d D_n(f_n),$$

where λ_n is the first non-trivial eigenvalue of the Graph Laplacian Δ_n and D_n is the discrete Dirichlet energy defined by

$$D_n(f_n) := \langle \nabla_n f_n, \nabla_n f_n \rangle_{\mathfrak{X}(X_n)}.$$

Proof. This result is obtained using standard tools from the elliptic PDE literature (in this case in the graph setting), noticing that the first non-trivial eigenvalue of the graph Laplacian λ_n is $C_d(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n})$-close to the first non-trivial eigenvalue of the Laplacian on the torus as it follows from [4].

□

Proposition 2.12. *Suppose that $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\rho_{n,t}, V_{n,t})$ is a solution to the discrete continuity equation and that*

$$\rho_{n,0} \geq m_0 > 0, \quad \rho_{n,1} \geq m_1 > 0.$$

For every $a \in (0,1)$ define

$$\rho^a_{n,t} := (1-a)\rho_{n,t} + a$$

and

$$V^a_{n,t} := (1-a)V_{n,t}.$$

Then, $t \mapsto (\rho^a_{n,t}, V^a_{n,t})$ solves the discrete continuity equation,

$$\mathcal{A}_n(\rho^a_{n,t}, V^a_{n,t}) \leq (1-a)\mathcal{A}_n(\rho_{n,t}, V_{n,t}), \quad \forall t \in [0,1],$$

and $\rho^a_{n,t} \geq a$ for every t. Moreover,

$$W(P_n(\rho^a_{n,0}), P_n(\rho_{n,0})) \leq C_d \operatorname{Lip}(\rho_{n,0}) \frac{a}{\sqrt{m_0}}, \quad W(P_n(\rho^a_{n,1}), P_n(\rho_{n,1})) \leq C_d \operatorname{Lip}(\rho_{n,1}) \frac{a}{\sqrt{m_1}}.$$

Proof. The fact that $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\rho^a_{n,t}, V^a_{n,t})$ solves the discrete continuity equation follows directly from the definitions. The relation between the actions of the two curves is obtained from the definitions, and the monotonicity and homogeneity of θ. To obtain the last inequalities, let us denote by ρ_0 the density of $P_n(\rho_{n,0})$ and by ρ^a_0 the density of $P_n(\rho^a_{n,0})$. It follows that,

$$\rho^a_0 = (1-a)\rho_0 + a.$$

We can then define $\rho^s := \rho_0 + sa(1-\rho_0)$ for $s \in [0,1]$ and note that $\rho^0 = \rho_0$ and $\rho^1 = \rho^a_0$. Finally, we define the (constant in time) vector field

$$\vec{V}_s := -a\nabla\left(\Delta^{-1}(1-\rho_0)\right),$$

where Δ^{-1} is the inverse of Δ (the Laplacian on $\mathbb{T}^d$), which is well defined for L^2-functions with average zero. It follows that $s \in [0,1] \mapsto (\rho^s, \vec{V}_s)$ satisfies the continuity equation in flux form. Moreover, using standard L^2 elliptic estimates we deduce that

$$(W(P_n(\rho_0), P_n(\rho^a_0)))^2 \leq \int_0^1 \mathcal{A}(\rho^s, \vec{V}_s) ds \leq C_d \frac{a^2}{m_0} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla\left(\Delta^{-1}(1-\rho_0)\right)|^2 dx \leq C_d \frac{a^2}{m_0} \|1-\rho_0\|^2_{L^2(\nu)}.$$

Noticing that $\|1-\rho_0\|^2_{L^2(\nu)} = \|1-\rho_{n,0}\|^2_{L^2(\nu_n)}$, we can use the discrete Poincare inequality (Lemma 2.11) and deduce that

$$(W(P_n(\rho_0), P_n(\rho^a_0)))^2 \leq C_d \frac{a^2}{m_0} D_n(\rho_{n,0}) \leq C_d \frac{a^2}{m_0} (\operatorname{Lip}(\rho_{n,0}))^2,$$

where the last inequality follows directly from the definition of $D_n(\rho_{n,0})$. The analogous inequality for $W(P_n(\rho_1), P_n(\rho^a_1))$ is obtained in exactly the same way. □

2.4. **Auxiliary results.** In this section we present some auxiliary results that we use in the proof of Theorem 1.20. These results allow us to relate local with non-local quantities.

Lemma 2.13. *Let $\vec{V}$ be a C^1-vector field defined on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \vec{V}(y)\cdot\frac{(y-x)}{\varepsilon} w_\varepsilon(x,y)dy = \alpha_d \int_0^\infty g(x,\varepsilon r) r^{d+1}\eta(r)dr,$$

where

$$g(x,s) := \fint_{B(x,s)} \operatorname{div}(\vec{V})dy,$$

and α_d is the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. Using polar coordinates we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \vec{V}(y)\cdot\frac{(y-x)}{\varepsilon} w_\varepsilon(x,y)dy &= \int_0^\infty \left(\int_{\partial B(0,r)} \vec{V}(x+\xi)\cdot\frac{\xi}{\varepsilon} dS(\xi)\right)\frac{1}{\varepsilon^d}\eta\left(\frac{r}{\varepsilon}\right)\frac{dr}{\varepsilon}\\
&= \int_0^\infty \left(\int_{\partial B(0,r)} \vec{V}(x+\xi)\cdot\frac{\xi}{r} dS(\xi)\right)\frac{1}{\varepsilon^d}\frac{r}{\varepsilon}\eta\left(\frac{r}{\varepsilon}\right)\frac{dr}{\varepsilon}\\
&= \int_0^\infty \left(\int_{B(x,r)} \operatorname{div}(\vec{V})dy\right)\frac{1}{\varepsilon^d}\frac{r}{\varepsilon}\eta\left(\frac{r}{\varepsilon}\right)\frac{dr}{\varepsilon}\\
&= \alpha_d\int_0^\infty \left(\fint_{B(x,r)} \operatorname{div}(\vec{V})dy\right)\frac{r^{d+1}}{\varepsilon^{d+1}}\eta\left(\frac{r}{\varepsilon}\right)\frac{dr}{\varepsilon},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

where the third equality follows from the divergence theorem. The desired identity is obtained from the above expression after changing variables $\hat{r} := \frac{r}{\varepsilon}$. □

Remark 2.14. Notice that since η is zero for $r \geq 1$, the vector field $\vec{V}$ only has to be defined on an ε-ball around x for the identity to make sense in the previous lemma.

Lemma 2.15. *Let $\vec{u}$ be a vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left(\vec{u}\cdot\frac{y-x}{\varepsilon}\right)\frac{y-x}{\varepsilon} w_\varepsilon(x,y)dy = \alpha_d\sigma_\eta\vec{u}.$$

Proof. Using polar coordinates we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left(\vec{u}\cdot\frac{y-x}{\varepsilon}\right)\frac{y-x}{\varepsilon} w_\varepsilon(x,y)dy &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon^d}\int_0^\infty\left(\int_{\partial B(0,r)}\vec{u}\cdot\frac{\xi}{\varepsilon}\frac{\xi}{\varepsilon}dS(\xi)\right)\eta\left(\frac{r}{\varepsilon}\right)dr\\
&= \left(\int_0^\infty \eta\left(\frac{r}{\varepsilon}\right)\frac{r^{d+1}}{\varepsilon^{d+1}}\frac{dr}{\varepsilon}\right)\int_{\partial B(0,1)}(\vec{u}\cdot\xi)\xi dS(\xi)\\
&= \sigma_\eta\int_{\partial B(0,1)}(\vec{u}\cdot\xi)\xi dS(\xi)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

Now, by symmetry it is clear that for every $\vec{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\int_{\partial B(0,1)}(\vec{u}\cdot\xi)\xi dS(\xi) = C\vec{u},$$

for some constant C to be determined. Let $\{e_1,\dots,e_d\}$ be the canonical basis for $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then,

$$\int_{\partial B(0,1)}(e_i\cdot\xi)^2 dS(\xi) = C, \quad \forall i = 1,\dots,d.$$

Hence,

$$d\alpha_d = \int_{\partial B(0,1)}\sum_{i=1}^d (e_i\cdot\xi)^2 dS(\xi) = dC,$$

where α_d is the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$ (note that $d\alpha_d$ is the surface area of the unit sphere). We conclude that $C = \alpha_d$ and the result now follows. □

The next is an immediate consequence of the previous result.

Corollary 2.16. *Let $\vec{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\frac{(y-x)\cdot \vec{u}}{\varepsilon} \right)^2 w_\varepsilon(x,y)dy = \alpha_d \sigma_\eta |\vec{u}|^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where α_d is the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Lemma 2.17. *Let $V : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be square integrable with respect to the measure $w_\varepsilon(x,y)dydx$ and define the vector field $\vec{V}$ by*

$$\vec{V}(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x,y) w_\varepsilon(x,y) \frac{(y-x)}{\varepsilon} dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then,

$$|\vec{V}(x)|^2 \le \alpha_d \sigma_\eta \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (V(x,y))^2 w_\varepsilon(x,y)dy, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Proof. Consider the vector $\vec{V}(x)$. Then, there exists a unit vector $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for which

$$|\vec{V}(x)| = \vec{V}(x)\cdot e,$$

Indeed if $\vec{V}(x) \neq 0$ we may take $e = \frac{\vec{V}(x)}{|\vec{V}(x)|}$ and if $\vec{V}(x) = 0$ we may take any unit vector. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |\vec{V}(x)|^2 &= (\vec{V}(x)\cdot e)^2 \\ &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x,y) w_\varepsilon(x,y) \frac{(y-x)\cdot e}{\varepsilon} dy \right)^2 \\ &\le \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\frac{(y-x)\cdot e}{\varepsilon} \right)^2 w_\varepsilon(x,y)dy \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (V(x,y))^2 w_\varepsilon(x,y)dy \right) \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

where the inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Combining this with Corollary 2.16 we obtain the desired inequality. □

3. Proof of Theorem 1.20

At the beginning of Subsection 2.3 we introduced a map $P_n : \mathcal{P}(X_n) \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ using the optimal transport map T_n. We now introduce a map $Q_n : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \to \mathcal{P}(X_n)$ as follows. Q_n associates to every probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ a discrete density ρ_n given by

$$\rho_n(\mathbf{x}_i) := \frac{\mu(U_i)}{\nu(U_i)} = n\mu(U_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

When $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ has a density ρ with respect to ν, we may sometimes abuse notation a little bit and write $Q_n(\rho)$ instead of $Q_n(\mu)$ and in that case

$$Q_n(\rho)(\mathbf{x}_i) = \fint_{U_i} \rho(x)dx, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

One simple observation is that the map $P_n \circ Q_n : \mathcal{P}(X_n) \to \mathcal{P}(X_n)$ is the identity map.

To establish Theorem 1.20, our goal is to construct a map $F_n : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d) \to \mathcal{P}(X_n)$ whose distortion is small and is such that $F_n(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ is close to $\mathcal{P}(X_n)$ in the W_n sense. The map F_n that we construct takes the form

$$F_n := Q_n \circ \mathbf{H}_s,$$

for a conveniently chosen value of $s > 0$. We split our proof into three parts that can be summarized as follows. Part 1: lower bound for $W(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ for arbitrary $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Part 2: upper bound for $W(\mu_0, \mu_1)$. In the final part we wrap up the argument.

In what follows, C is used to represent constants that depend on d and θ; the value of C may change from line to line. We will also consider constants that depend on some parameters to be chosen later on. If the parameter is denoted by h, we use $C(h)$ to represent a constant that depends on this parameter; the values of $C(h)$ may change form line to line.

3.1. **Part 1.** Let $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ be arbitrary and let $t \mapsto (\mu_t, \vec{V}_t)$ be a geodesic connecting μ_0 and μ_1, i.e.,

$$\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\vec{V}_t(x)|^2 d\mu_t(x) dt = (W(\mu_0, \mu_1))^2.$$

For a fixed value of $s > 0$ (to be chosen later on) we define $\rho_t^s := \mathbf{H}_s(\mu_t)$ and $\vec{V}_t^s := \mathbf{H}_s(\vec{V}_t \mu_t)$. We recall that Lemma 2.8 guarantees that $t \mapsto (\rho_t^s, \vec{V}_t^s)$ is a solution to the continuity equation in flux form.

Let $\rho_{n,t} := Q_n(\rho_t^s)$. Then, for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \fint_{U_i} \frac{d}{dt}\rho_t^s(x)dx = -\fint_{U_i} \operatorname{div}(\vec{V}_t^s)dx, \quad t \in (0,1).$$

We claim that

$$W_n(Q_n(\mathbf{H}_s(\mu_0)), Q_n(\mathbf{H}_s(\mu_1))) \leq W(\mu_0, \mu_1) + C(s)\left(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}\right)^{1/2}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $C(s)$ depends on the parameter s; it blows up as $s \to 0$. Our plan to prove this inequality is the following. First, notice that the curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto \rho_{n,t}$ in $\mathcal{P}(X_n)$ connects the discrete measures $Q_n(\rho_0)$ and $Q_n(\rho_1)$, but the equation satisfied by $\rho_{n,t}$ is not the discrete continuity equation. Because of this, we construct a suitable solution $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, V_{n,t})$ to the discrete continuity equation that starts at $Q_n(\rho_0)$ and stays close to the curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto \rho_{n,t}$; an important feature of this new curve is that its discrete action is comparable to the action of the curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\rho_t^s, \vec{V}_t^s)$. From the triangle inequality we will conclude that up to a small error $W_n(Q_n(\rho_0), Q_n(\rho_1))$ is below $W(\rho_0, \rho_1)$.

With this road map in mind, let us start by defining $\tilde{\varepsilon}_n := \varepsilon_n - 2\delta_n$ and consider the discrete vector field $V_{n,t}$ defined by

$$V_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) := \frac{1}{\alpha_d \sigma_\eta} \fint_{U_i} \fint_{U_j} \vec{V}_t^s(x) \cdot \frac{y-x}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} \frac{w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(x,y)}{w_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)} dydx, \quad i,j = 1, \dots, n,$$

using the convention that $\frac{0}{0} = 0$. Let $\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}$ be the solution to the equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i) + \operatorname{div}_n(V_{n,t})(\mathbf{x}_i) = 0, \quad \forall t \in (0,1), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n, \tag{3.2}$$

with initial condition $\tilde{\rho}_{n,0} = \rho_{n,0}$. We will later prove that $\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}$ is indeed a discrete density by showing that it is a non-negative function (see Remark 1.5). This however will be a direct consequence of the fact that $\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}$ is uniformly close to $\rho_{n,t}$. In what follows we focus on proving this last statement.

First, notice that

(3.3)

$$\alpha_d \sigma_\eta \operatorname{div}_n(V_{n,t})(\mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{1}{n\varepsilon_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \fint_{U_i} \fint_{U_j} \vec{V}_t^s(x) \cdot \frac{y-x}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(x,y) dydx + \frac{1}{n\varepsilon_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \fint_{U_i} \fint_{U_j} \vec{V}_t^s(y) \cdot \frac{y-x}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(x,y) dydx.$$

Now, for every $x \in U_i$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \fint_{U_j} \frac{y-x}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(x,y) dy = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{y-x}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(x,y) dy = 0,$$

where we notice that the last equality follows from radial symmetry; we conclude that the first term on the right hand side of (3.3) is equal to zero. The second term on the right hand side

of (3.3) can be written as

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon_n} \fint_{U_i} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \vec{V}_t^s(y) \cdot \frac{y-x}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(x,y) dy \right) dx = \alpha_d \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}{\varepsilon_n} \fint_{U_i} \int_0^\infty g(x, \tilde{\varepsilon}_n r) r^{d+1} \eta(r) dr dx,$$

where the equality follows from Lemma 2.13; we recall that

$$g(x, \tilde{\varepsilon}_n r) = \fint_{B(x, \tilde{\varepsilon}_n r)} \operatorname{div}(\vec{V}_t^s)(y) dy.$$

Therefore,

$$\operatorname{div}_n(V_{n,t})(\mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{1}{\sigma_\eta} \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}{\varepsilon_n} \fint_{U_i} \int_0^\infty g(x, \tilde{\varepsilon}_n r) r^{d+1} \eta(r) dr dx, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n,$$

and in particular, for every $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\operatorname{div}_n(V_{n,t})(\mathbf{x}_i) - \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}{\varepsilon_n} \fint_{U_i} \operatorname{div}(\vec{V}_t^s) dx| &= \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}{\varepsilon_n} \left| \frac{1}{\sigma_\eta} \fint_{U_i} \int_0^\infty (g(x, \tilde{\varepsilon}_n r) - \operatorname{div} \vec{V}_t^s(x)) r^{d+1} \eta(r) dr dx \right| \\
&= \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}{\varepsilon_n} \left| \frac{1}{\sigma_\eta} \fint_{U_i} \int_0^\infty \fint_{B(x, \tilde{\varepsilon}_n r)} (\operatorname{div} \vec{V}_t^s(y) - \operatorname{div}(\vec{V}_t^s)(x)) r^{d+1} \eta(r) dy dr dx \right| \\
&\leq \frac{\|D^2 \vec{V}_t^s\|_\infty}{\sigma_\eta} \varepsilon_n \fint_{U_i} \int_0^\infty r^{d+2} \eta(r) dr dx \\
&= C_d \|D^2 \vec{V}_t^s\|_\infty \varepsilon_n.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for every $i = 1, \dots, n$

$$|\left(\frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}{\varepsilon_n} - 1 \right) \fint_{U_i} \operatorname{div}(\vec{V}_t^s) dx| \leq 2 \operatorname{Lip}(\vec{V}_t^s) \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}$$

Combining the previous two inequalities we deduce that for every $t \in [0,1]$ and for every $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i)| &\leq C(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}) \int_0^1 (\operatorname{Lip}(\vec{V}_r^s) + \|D^2 \vec{V}_r^s\|_\infty) dr \\
&\leq C(s)(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}) \left(\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\vec{V}_r(x)|^2 d\mu_r(x) dr \right)^{1/2} \\
&= C(s)(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}) W(\mu_0, \mu_1) \\
&\leq C(s)(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

where the second inequality follows from Proposition 2.9, and the last inequality follows from the fact that the Wasserstein distance between two arbitrary measures in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is bounded above by the diameter of $\mathbb{T}^d$.

From Proposition 2.8 we know that

$$\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \fint_{U_i} \rho_t^s(x) dx \geq c_1(s) > 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Assuming we choose $s > 0$ so that

$$C(s)(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}) \leq \frac{c_1(s)}{2}, \tag{3.5}$$

we conclude from (3.4) that for all $t \in [0,1]$, both $\tilde{\rho}_{t,n}$ and $\rho_{t,n}$ are lower bounded by $c_1(s)/2$. In particular, combining this with Lemma 2.7 we deduce that

$$W_n(\rho_{n,1}, \tilde{\rho}_{n,1}) \leq C(s)(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}) + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{N}})). \tag{3.6}$$

To estimate the total action of $t \mapsto (\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, V_{n,t})$, first notice that for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and every $x \in U_i$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \rho_t^s(x)| &\le |\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i)| + |\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \rho_t^s(x)| \\
&\le C(s)\left(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}\right) + 2\delta_n C_2(s) =: \kappa(n,s),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}
$$

which follows directly from (3.4), the definition of $\rho_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i)$, and Proposition 2.8. Hence, for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ and all $x \in U_i$, $y \in U_j$ and the monotonicity and homogeneity of θ

$$
(1 + \frac{2\kappa(n,s)}{c_1(s)})\theta(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i), \tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j)) \ge \theta(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i) + \kappa(n,s), \tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j) + \kappa(n,s)) \ge \theta(\rho_t^s(x), \rho_t^s(y)), \tag{3.8}
$$

where the last inequality follows from the monotonicity of θ and (3.7). Likewise,

$$
\rho_t^s(x) = \theta(\rho_t^s(x), \rho_t^s(x)) \le \left(1 + \frac{C_2(s)}{c_1(s)}|y - x|\right)\theta(\rho_t^s(x), \rho_t^s(y)), \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{T}^d. \tag{3.9}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{A}_n(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, V_{n,t}) = \frac{1}{\alpha_d^2 \sigma_\eta^2 n^2} \sum_{i,j} \left(\fint_{U_i} \fint_{U_j} \vec{V}_t^s(x) \cdot \frac{y - x}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} \frac{w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(x,y)}{w_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)} dy dx \right)^2 \frac{w_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)}{\theta(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i), \tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j))} \\
&\le \frac{1}{\alpha_d^2 \sigma_\eta^2 n^2}(1 + C_d \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}) \sum_{i,j} \fint_{U_i} \fint_{U_j} \left(\vec{V}_t^s(x) \cdot \frac{y - x}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} \right)^2 w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(x,y) dy dx \frac{1}{\theta(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i), \tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j))} \\
&\le \frac{1}{\alpha_d^2 \sigma_\eta^2 n^2}(1 + C_d \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n})(1 + \frac{2\kappa(n,s)}{c_1(s)}) \sum_{i,j} \fint_{U_i} \fint_{U_j} \left(\vec{V}_t^s(x) \cdot \frac{y - x}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} \right)^2 \frac{w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(x,y)}{\rho_t^s(x)} (1 + C(s)|y - x|) dy dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha_d^2 \sigma_\eta^2}(1 + C_d \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n})(1 + \frac{2\kappa(n,s)}{c_1(s)}) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left(\vec{V}_t^s(x) \cdot \frac{y - x}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} \right)^2 \frac{w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(x,y)}{\rho_t^s(x)} (1 + C(s)|y - x|) dy dx \\
&\le \frac{1}{\alpha_d \sigma_\eta} \left(1 + C\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n} + C\frac{\kappa(n,s)}{c_1(s)} + C(s)\varepsilon_n\right) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{|\vec{V}_t^s(x)|^2}{\rho_t^s(x)} dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}
$$

In the above, the first inequality was obtained using Jensen's inequality and the fact that $\frac{w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(x,y)}{w_{\varepsilon_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)} \le \left(\frac{\varepsilon_n}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}\right)^d \le 1 + C_d \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}$; the second inequality was obtained using (3.8) and (3.9); the third inequality follows from Corollary 2.16. Integrating the above inequality over t and using Proposition 2.8, we deduce that

$$
(W_n(\tilde{\rho}_{n,0}, \tilde{\rho}_{n,1}))^2 \le \int_0^1 \mathcal{A}_n(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, V_{n,t}) dt \le \frac{1}{\alpha_d \sigma_\eta}(W(\mu_0, \mu_1))^2 + C\left(\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n} + \frac{\kappa(n,s)}{c_1(s)} + C(s)\varepsilon_n\right)
$$

which together with (3.6) and the triangle inequality imply that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&W_n(\rho_{n,0}, \rho_{n,1}) \le W_n(\rho_{n,0}, \tilde{\rho}_{n,1}) + W_n(\tilde{\rho}_{n,1}, \rho_{n,1}) \\
&\le \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_d \sigma_\eta}} W(\mu_0, \mu_1) + C\left(\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n} + \frac{\kappa(n,s)}{c_1(s)} + C(s)\varepsilon_n\right)^{1/2} + C(s)\left(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}\right) + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{N}})).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}
$$

3.2. **Part 2.** For $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ we consider $\rho_{n,0} := Q_n(\mathbf{H}_s(\mu_0))$ and $\rho_{n,1} := Q_n(\mathbf{H}_s(\mu_1))$ as in Part 1. Notice that by the definition of Q and Proposition 2.8,

$$
C_d C_2(s) \ge \rho_{n,0}, \rho_{n,1} \ge c_1(s), \quad \operatorname{Lip}(\rho_{n,0}), \operatorname{Lip}(\rho_{n,1}) \le C_2(s).
$$

Let $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\rho_{n,t}, V_{n,t})$ be a geodesic connecting $\rho_{n,0}$ and $\rho_{n,1}$. By the discrete smoothening step in Section 2.3 (Proposition 2.10 and Proposition 2.12), for fixed $a \in (0,1)$ and $b \in (c\delta_n, i_d)$, we can construct a curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, \tilde{V}_{n,t})$ satisfying the following properties

(1) For every $i, j = 1, \dots, n$

$$|\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j)| \leq C(b)(|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j| + \delta_n).$$

(2) For all $t \in [0,1]$,

$$C(b) \geq \tilde{\rho}_{n,t} \geq a.$$

(3) For all $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i) + \operatorname{div}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\tilde{V}_{n,t})(\mathbf{x}_i) = 0.$$

(4) $\int_0^1 \mathcal{A}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, \tilde{V}_{n,t})dt \leq (1 + C_d\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n})(W_n(\rho_{n,0}, \rho_{n,1}))^2$.

(5) $W(P_n(\tilde{\rho}_{n,j}), P_n(\rho_{n,j})) \leq C(s)a + C(s)(1 + \frac{1}{a})(b + \delta_n)$, for $j = 0, 1$.

We recall that $\tilde{\varepsilon}_n = \varepsilon_n + C_d\delta_n$ and that $\operatorname{div}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}$, $\mathcal{A}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}$ are defined in Proposition 2.10.

For every $t \in [0,1]$, let $\tilde{\rho}_t := P_n(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t})$. Observe that for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{\rho}_t(x) = -\operatorname{div}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\tilde{V}_{n,t})(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad \forall x \in U_i.$$

We notice that although the path $t \in [0,1] \mapsto \tilde{\rho}_t$ in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ does indeed connect the measures with densities $\tilde{\rho}_0$ and $\tilde{\rho}_1$, the equation satisfied by $\tilde{\rho}_t$ is not directly seen as the continuity equation. Because of this, we construct a suitable solution $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\tilde{\rho}_t^h, V_t^h)$ to the continuity equation which starts at $\tilde{\rho}_0^h$ (a mollified version of $\tilde{\rho}_0$ using a parameter $h > 0$ to be chosen later on) and stays close to the original curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto \tilde{\rho}_t$. The smoothness of $\tilde{\rho}_t^h$ and the regularity of $\tilde{\rho}_t$ (coming from the regularity of $\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}$) guarantee that the L^∞ norm of $\tilde{\rho}_t^h - \tilde{\rho}_t$ is small. We use this to establish that the action associated to the curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\tilde{\rho}_t^h, \vec{V}_t^h)$ is, up to a small error, smaller than the discrete action of the curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, \tilde{V}_{n,t})$.

Let $\vec{V}_t$ be the vector field defined by

$$\vec{V}_t(x) := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \tilde{V}_{n,t}(T_n(x), T_n(y)) w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(T_n(x), T_n(y)) \frac{y - x}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d,$$

and for fixed $h > 0$ (to be chosen later on) consider the mollified vector field

$$\vec{V}_t^h := J_h * \vec{V}_t.$$

Let $\phi \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and let $\psi := J_h * \phi$. Then, as in (2.3),

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \vec{V}_t^h(x) \cdot \nabla\phi(x)dx &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \vec{V}_t(x) \cdot \nabla\psi(x)dx \\
&= \sum_{i,j} \tilde{V}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \int_{U_i}\int_{U_j} \frac{y - x}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} \cdot \nabla\psi(x)dydx \\
&= \sum_{i,j} \tilde{V}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \int_{U_i}\int_{U_j} \frac{\psi(y) - \psi(x)}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} dydx + \gamma_{n,t} \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j} \tilde{V}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \fint_{U_i}\fint_{U_j} \frac{\psi(y) - \psi(x)}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} dydx + \gamma_{n,t} \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j} \tilde{V}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \frac{\psi(\mathbf{x}_j) - \psi(\mathbf{x}_i)}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} + \gamma_{n,t} + \beta_{n,t} \\
&= \langle \tilde{V}_{n,t}, \nabla_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}\psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{X}(X_n)} + \gamma_{n,t} + \beta_{n,t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us estimate $\gamma_{n,t}$ and $\beta_{n,t}$. Indeed, using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, it is straightforward to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\gamma_{n,t}| &\leq \sum_{i,j} |\tilde{V}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)| w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \int_{U_i} \int_{U_j} \frac{\|D^2\psi\|_\infty |y-x|^2}{2\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} dy dx \\
&\leq \|D^2\psi\|_\infty \sum_{i,j} |\tilde{V}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)| w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \int_{U_i} \int_{U_j} \frac{|y-x|^2}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} dx dy \\
&\leq \|D^2\psi\|_\infty \tilde{\varepsilon}_n \sum_{i,j} |\tilde{V}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)| w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \int_{U_i} \int_{U_j} \frac{|y-x|^2}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^2} dx dy \\
&\leq C \|D^2\psi\|_\infty \varepsilon_n (\mathcal{A}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, \tilde{V}_{n,t}))^{1/2},
\end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\beta_{n,t}| &\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j} |\tilde{V}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)| w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \frac{2 \operatorname{Lip}(\psi) \delta_n}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} \\
&\leq C \operatorname{Lip}(\psi) \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n} (\mathcal{A}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, \tilde{V}_{n,t}))^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for every $t \in [0,1]$,

(3.12)

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \vec{V}_t^h \cdot \nabla \phi dx - \langle \tilde{V}_{n,t}, \nabla_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} \psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{X}(X_n)} \right| &\leq C(\operatorname{Lip}(\psi) + \|D^2\psi\|_\infty)(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n})(\mathcal{A}_n(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, \tilde{V}_{n,t}))^{1/2} \\
&\leq C(h) \|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} (\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n})(\mathcal{A}_n(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, \tilde{V}_{n,t}))^{1/2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Proposition 2.8.

Let $\tilde{\rho}_t^h$ be the solution of

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\rho}_t^h(x) + \operatorname{div}(\vec{V}_t^h)(x) = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{T}^d,$$

with initial condition $\tilde{\rho}_0^h = J_h * \tilde{\rho}_0$. We will later show that $\tilde{\rho}_t^h$ is a density by showing that it is a non-negative function. This, however, will follow from the fact that $\tilde{\rho}_t^h$ is uniformly close to $\tilde{\rho}_t$. We now focus on showing this. Indeed, at the discrete level, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle \tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, J_h * \phi \rangle_{L^2(\nu_n)} = \langle \tilde{V}_{n,t}, \nabla_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n} (J_h * \phi) \rangle_{\mathfrak{X}(X_n)},$$

and at the continuum level

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle \tilde{\rho}_t^h, \phi \rangle_{L^2(\nu)} = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \vec{V}_t^h \cdot \nabla \phi(x) dx.$$

Using (3.12) we deduce that

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \left(\langle \tilde{\rho}_t^h, \phi \rangle_{L^2(\nu)} - \langle \tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, J_h * \phi \rangle_{L^2(\nu_n)} \right) \right| \leq C(h) \|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} (\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n})(\mathcal{A}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, \tilde{V}_{n,t}))^{1/2}.$$

From this and Jensen's inequality it follows that for all $t \in [0,1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle \tilde{\rho}_t^h, \phi \rangle_{L^2(\nu)} - \langle \tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, J_h * \phi \rangle_{L^2(\nu_n)}| &\leq C(h) \|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \left(\int_0^1 \mathcal{A}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\tilde{\rho}_{n,r}, \tilde{V}_{n,r}) dr \right)^{1/2} (\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}) \\
&\quad + |\langle \tilde{\rho}_0^h, \phi \rangle_{L^2(\nu)} - \langle \tilde{\rho}_{n,0}, J_h * \phi \rangle_{L^2(\nu_n)}| \\
&\leq C(h) \|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} (\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}) + |\langle \tilde{\rho}_0^h, \phi \rangle_{L^2(\nu)} - \langle \tilde{\rho}_{n,0}, J_h * \phi \rangle_{L^2(\nu_n)}|,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used property (4) of the curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, \tilde{V}_{n,t})$, Proposition 2.1 and the fact that $\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_N)) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Now, using the fact that $\tilde{\rho}_0^h = J_h * \tilde{\rho}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle \tilde{\rho}_0^h, \phi\rangle_{L^2(\nu)} - \langle \tilde{\rho}_{n,0}, J_h * \phi\rangle_{L^2(\nu_n)}| &= |\langle \tilde{\rho}_0, J_h * \phi\rangle_{L^2(\nu)} - \langle \tilde{\rho}_{n,0}, J_h * \phi\rangle_{L^2(\nu_n)}| \\ &= |\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (J_h * \phi(T_n(x)) - J_h * \phi(x))\tilde{\rho}_0(x)dx| \\ &\leq C_3(h)\delta_n \|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for every $t \in [0,1]$,

$$|\langle \tilde{\rho}_t^h, \phi\rangle_{L^2(\nu)} - \langle \tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, J_h * \phi\rangle_{L^2(\nu_n)}| \leq C(h)\|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)}(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}). \tag{3.13}$$

On the other hand,

$$|\langle \tilde{\rho}_{n,t}, J_h * \phi\rangle_{L^2(\nu_n)} - \langle \tilde{\rho}_t, J_h * \phi\rangle_{L^2(\nu)}| = \left|\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (J_h * \phi(T_n(x)) - J_h * \phi(x))\tilde{\rho}_t(x)dx\right| \leq \delta_n C_3(h)\|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)}. \tag{3.14}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle \tilde{\rho}_t, J_h * \phi\rangle_{L^2(\nu)} - \langle \tilde{\rho}_t, \phi\rangle_{L^2(\nu)}| &= |\langle J_h * \tilde{\rho}_t, \phi\rangle_{L^2(\nu)} - \langle \tilde{\rho}_t, \phi\rangle_{L^2(\nu)}| \\ &\leq \int_{T^d} |\tilde{\rho}_t(x) - J_h * \tilde{\rho}_t(x)||\phi(x)|dx \\ &\leq \sum_{i,j} \int_{U_i}\int_{U_j} J_h(x-z)|\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j)||\phi(x)|dzdx \\ &\leq C(b)\sum_{i,j} \int_{U_i}\int_{U_j} J_h(x-z)(|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j| + \delta_n)|\phi(x)|dzdx \\ &\leq C(b)\sum_{i,j} \int_{U_i}\int_{U_j} J_h(x-z)(|x-z| + \delta_n)||\phi(x)|dzdx \\ &\leq C(b)(\sqrt{h} + \delta_n)\|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

From the triangle inequality and (3.13), (3.14), (3.15), it follows that

$$|\langle \tilde{\rho}_t^h - \tilde{\rho}_t, \phi\rangle_{L^2(\nu)}| \leq C\left(C(h)(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}) + C(b)(\sqrt{h} + \delta_n)\right)\|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)}$$

Since the previous inequality holds for arbitrary $\phi \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$, we conclude that

$$\|\tilde{\rho}_t^h - \tilde{\rho}_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)} \leq C\left(C(h)(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}) + C(b)(\sqrt{h} + \delta_n)\right) =: \xi(n,h,b). \tag{3.16}$$

We may pick our parameters appropriately so that in particular

$$\xi(n,h,b) \leq \frac{a}{3}. \tag{3.17}$$

We conclude that both $\tilde{\rho}_t^h$ and $\tilde{\rho}_t$ are bounded below by $a/3$ for all $t \in [0,1]$. In particular, $\tilde{\rho}_t^h$ is a density and, moreover, from Lemma 2.6

$$W(\tilde{\rho}_t(x)dx, \tilde{\rho}_t^h(x)dx) \leq C\left(C(s) + \frac{1}{a}\right)\xi(n,h,b). \tag{3.18}$$

Let us now estimate the total action of $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\tilde{\rho}_t^h, \vec{V}_t^h)$. Observe that from (3.16) it follows that

$$\tilde{\rho}_t^h(x) \geq (1 - 2\frac{\xi(n,h,b)}{a})\tilde{\rho}_t(x) \geq \frac{\tilde{\rho}_t(x)}{1 + C\xi(n,h,b)/a}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

Also, from the definition of $\tilde{\rho}_t$ and the properties of $\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}$, it follows that

$$\tilde{\rho}_t(x) \geq \frac{\tilde{\rho}_t(z)}{1+\frac{C(b)}{a}\left(|z-x|+\delta_n\right)}, \quad \forall x, z \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{|\vec{V}_t^h(x)|^2}{\tilde{\rho}_t^h(x)}dx &\leq (1+C\frac{\xi(n,h,b)}{a})\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\frac{|\vec{V}_t^h(x)|^2}{\tilde{\rho}_t(x)}dx \\
&\leq (1+C\frac{\xi(n,h,b)}{a})\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} J_h(x-z)\frac{|\vec{V}_t(z)|^2}{\tilde{\rho}_t(x)}dzdx \\
&\leq (1+C\frac{\xi(n,h,b)}{a})\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} J_h(x-z)(1+\frac{C(b)}{a}(|z-x|+\delta_n))\frac{|\vec{V}_t(z)|^2}{\tilde{\rho}_t(z)}dzdx \\
&\leq (1+C\frac{\xi(n,h,b)}{a}+C\frac{C(b)}{a}\sqrt{h}+C\frac{C(b)}{a}\delta_n)\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\frac{|\vec{V}_t(z)|^2}{\tilde{\rho}_t(z)}dz \\
&\leq (1+C\frac{\xi(n,h,b)}{a})\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\frac{|\vec{V}_t(z)|^2}{\rho_t(z)}dz,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Jensen's inequality. Using Lemma 2.17 with

$$V(x,y) := \tilde{V}_{n,t}(T_n(x),T_n(y))\frac{w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(T_n(x),T_n(y))}{w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n+2\delta_n}(x,y)},$$

and using the fact that for every $z \in U_i$ and $|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j| \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_n$ we have

$$\tilde{\rho}_t(z) \geq \frac{\theta(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_i),\tilde{\rho}_{n,t}(\mathbf{x}_j))}{1+\frac{C(b)}{a}\varepsilon_n},$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\frac{|\vec{V}_t(z)|^2}{\tilde{\rho}_t(z)}dz &\leq \alpha_d\sigma_\eta(1+C\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n})\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}(\tilde{V}_{n,t}(T_n(z),T_n(y)))^2\left(\frac{w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(T_n(z),T_n(y))}{w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n+2\delta_n}(z,y)}\right)^2\frac{w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n+2\delta_n}(z,y)}{\tilde{\rho}_t(z)}dydz \\
&\leq \alpha_d\sigma_\eta(1+C\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n})\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}(\tilde{V}_{n,t}(T_n(z),T_n(y)))^2\frac{w_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(T_n(x),T_n(y))}{\tilde{\rho}_t(z)}dydz \\
&\leq (1+C\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n})(1+\frac{C(b)}{a}\varepsilon_n)\alpha_d\sigma_\eta\mathcal{A}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t},\tilde{V}_{n,t}), \\
&\leq (1+C\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}+\frac{C(b)}{a}\varepsilon_n)\alpha_d\sigma_\eta\mathcal{A}_{n,\tilde{\varepsilon}_n}(\tilde{\rho}_{n,t},\tilde{V}_{n,t})
\end{aligned}$$

Integrating the above inequalities with respect to t and using the properties of the curve $t \in [0,1] \mapsto (\tilde{\rho}_{n,t},\tilde{V}_{n,t})$, we see that

$$(W(\tilde{\rho}_0^h dx, \tilde{\rho}_1^h dx))^2 \leq \alpha_d\sigma_\eta(W_n(\rho_{n,0},\rho_{n,1}))^2 + C(\frac{\xi(n,h,b)}{a}+\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}+\frac{C(b)}{a}\varepsilon_n).$$

Combining the previous inequality with (3.18) and using the triangle inequality, we deduce that

(3.19)

$$\begin{aligned}
W(\tilde{\rho}_0 dx, \tilde{\rho}_1 dx) &\leq \sqrt{\alpha_d\sigma_\eta}W_n(\rho_{n,0},\rho_{n,1}) + C\left(\frac{\xi(n,h,b)}{a}+\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}+\frac{C(b)}{a}\varepsilon_n\right)^{1/2} + C(C(s)+\frac{1}{a})\xi(n,h,b). \\
&=: \sqrt{\alpha_d\sigma_\eta}W_n(\rho_{n,0},\rho_{n,1}) + \zeta(n,h,b,a,s).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, from the triangle inequality, the above inequality and the properties of $\tilde{\rho}_{n,j}$ $(j = 0, 1)$ we obtain

(3.20)

$$\begin{aligned} &W(\mu_0,\mu_1) \le W(\mu_0, \mathbf{H}_s(\mu_0)) + W(\mathbf{H}_s(\mu_0), P_n(\rho_{n,0})) + W(P_n(\rho_{n,0}), P_n(\tilde{\rho}_{n,0})) + W(P_n(\tilde{\rho}_{n,0}), P_n(\tilde{\rho}_{n,1})) \\ &+ W(P_n(\tilde{\rho}_{n,1}), P_n(\rho_{n,1})) + W(P_n(\rho_{n,1}), \mathbf{H}_s(\mu_1)) + W(\mathbf{H}_s(\mu_1), \mu_1) \\ &\le \sqrt{\alpha_d \sigma_\eta} W_n(\rho_{n,0}, \rho_{n,1}) + 2\sqrt{s} + 2\delta_n + C(s)a + C(s)(1 + \frac{1}{a})(b + \delta_n) + \zeta(n, h, b, a, s). \end{aligned}$$

3.3. **Wrapping up.** Let $\rho_n \in \mathcal{P}(X_n)$ and for $s > 0$ let $\rho^s : \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be the density

$$\rho^s := \mathbf{H}_s \circ P_n(\rho_n).$$

Then,

(3.21)

$$\begin{aligned} W_n(\rho_n, Q_n(\rho^s)) &= W_n(Q_n(P_n(\rho_n)), Q_n(\rho^s)) \\ &\le CW(Q_n(P_n(\rho_n)), Q_n(\rho^s)) + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{N}})) \\ &\le C\left(W(Q_n(P_n(\rho_n)), P_n(\rho_n)) + W(P_n(\rho_n), \rho^s) + W(\rho^s, Q_n(\rho^s))\right) + \varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{N}})) \\ &\le CW(P_n(\rho_n), \rho^s) + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{N}})) \\ &= CW(P_n(\rho_n), \mathbf{H}_s \circ P_n(\rho_n)) + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{N}})) \\ &\le C\sqrt{s} + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{N}})) \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from the fact that $Q_n \circ P_n$ is the identity mapping on $\mathcal{P}(X_n)$; the first inequality follows from Lemma 2.1; the second inequality follows from the triangle inequality; the third inequality follows from the definition of the map Q_n and the fact that the cells U_i have diameter of order δ_n; the last equality follows from Proposition 2.8. The above inequality says that for any given $\rho_n \in \mathcal{P}(X_n)$, we can find a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(T_d)$ for which $Q_n \circ \mathbf{H}_s(\mu)$ is within distance $C\sqrt{s} + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{N}}))$ from ρ_n .

We can now take $n \to \infty$, so that $\varepsilon_n \to 0$, $\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n} \to 0$ and $\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{N}})) \to 0$. Then we can take $h \to 0$, $b \to 0$, $a \to 0$ and finally $s \to 0$ (in that order) in all the above estimates to conclude that we can pick $h := h_n$, $b := b_n$, $a := a_n$, $s := s_n$ to guarantee that (3.5) and (3.17) are satisfied and that the quantities

$$\varrho_n^1 := C\left(\frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n} + \frac{\kappa(n, s_n)}{c_1(s_n)} + C(s_n)\varepsilon_n\right)^{1/2} + C(s_n)\left(\varepsilon_n + \frac{\delta_n}{\varepsilon_n}\right) + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{N}})),$$

$$\varrho_n^2 := 2\sqrt{s_n} + 2\delta_n + C(s_n)a_n + C(s_n)(1 + \frac{1}{a_n})(b_n + \delta_n) + \zeta(n, h_n, b_n, a_n, s_n),$$

$$\varrho_n^3 := C\sqrt{s_n} + C\varepsilon_n \operatorname{diam}_\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{N}})),$$

all converge to zero as $n \to \infty$. We can then define,

$$\varrho_n := \max\{\varrho_n^1, \varrho_n^2, \varrho_n^3\},$$

and observe that from (3.11), (3.20), (3.21) it follows that the map $F_n := Q_n \circ \mathbf{H}_{s_n}$ is a ϱ_n-isometry. We conclude that $(\mathcal{P}(X_n), W_n)$ converges in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense towards $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}^d), \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_d \sigma_\eta}} W)$.

References

[1] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré, *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*, Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2005.

[2] J.-D. Benamou and Y. Brenier, *A computational fluid mechanics solution to the Monge-Kantorovich mass transfer problem*, Numer. Math., 84 (2000), pp. 375–393.

[3] D. Burago, Y. Burago, and S. Ivanov, *A course in metric geometry*, vol. 33 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.

[4] D. Burago, S. Ivanov, and Y. Kurylev, *A graph discretization of the Laplace-Beltrami operator*, J. Spectr. Theory, 4 (2014), pp. 675–714.

[5] M. Á. Carreira-Perpiñán, *A review of mean-shift algorithms for clustering*, CoRR, abs/1503.00687 (2015).

[6] T. Champion, L. De Pascale, and P. Juutinen, *The ∞-Wasserstein distance: local solutions and existence of optimal transport maps*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 40 (2008), pp. 1–20.
[7] S.-N. Chow, W. Huang, Y. Li, and H. Zhou, *Fokker-Planck equations for a free energy functional or Markov process on a graph*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 203 (2012), pp. 969–1008.
[8] E. Davis and S. Sethuraman, *Consistency of modularity clustering on random geometric graphs*. 2016.
[9] M. Erbar and J. Maas, *Ricci curvature of finite markov chains via convexity of the entropy*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis, 206 (2012), pp. 997–1038.
[10] N. García Trillos and D. Slepčev, *On the rate of convergence of empirical measures in ∞-transportation distance*, Canad. J. Math., 67 (2015), pp. 1358–1383.
[11] ———, *Continuum limit of total variation on point clouds*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 220 (2016), pp. 193–241.
[12] N. Gigli, *On the heat flow on metric measure spaces: existence, uniqueness and stability*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, 39 (2010), pp. 101–120.
[13] N. Gigli and J. Maas, *Gromov-Hausdorff convergence of discrete transportation metrics*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 45 (2013), pp. 879–899.
[14] R. Jordan, D. Kinderlehrer, and F. Otto, *The variational formulation of the Fokker-Planck equation*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 29 (1998), pp. 1–17.
[15] J. Maas, *Gradient flows of the entropy for finite Markov chains*, J. Funct. Anal., 261 (2011), pp. 2250–2292.
[16] D. Ting, L. Huang, and M. I. Jordan, *An analysis of the convergence of graph Laplacians*, in Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning, 2010.
[17] N. G. Trillos and D. Slepčev, *A variational approach to the consistency of spectral clustering*, Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis, (2016), pp. –.
[18] N. G. Trillos, D. Slepčev, J. von Brecht, T. Laurent, and X. Bresson, *Consistency of cheeger and ratio graph cuts*, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 17 (2016), pp. 1–46.
[19] U. von Luxburg, M. Belkin, and O. Bousquet, *Consistency of spectral clustering*, Ann. Statist., 36 (2008), pp. 555–586.
[20] X. Wang, *Spectral convergence rate of graph laplacian*. 2015.

Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, Providence, RI, 02912, USA.